



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The American Catholic quarterly review

205
A5123

ANNEX



LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY

ANNEX

ANNEX

3300 - 28523

THE
AMERICAN
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas
vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.
S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii, AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XIV.
FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1889.

LIBRARY
OF THE
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY & MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

134228

COPYRIGHT, 1889,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

MADE IN
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE AUTHOR

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LAND AND LABOR IN FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES. By <i>Mgr. Bernard O'Reilly, D.D.</i> ,	1
M. Claudio Jannet on social degeneracy in this country, 1; What M. Drumont thinks of the same question in France, 2; Ancient land-holding in Ireland, 3; Many small land-owners in France before the Revolution, 4; More large proprietors now than then, 5; The working people have gained nothing by the Revolution, 6; The Church the only friend of the workingman in France, 7; Catholic advocates of the rights of labor, 8; The evil influence of monopolists in France, 9; Misdeeds of members of the Government, 10; Bringing financial ruin on their country, 11; Need of united action among all friends of religion, 12; Present need of applying mediæval social principles, 13; An admirable plan in practical application at Anzin, 14; Carrying out F. le Play's principles, 15; M. Jannet's latest observations on the United States, 17; Recent changes in our agricultural condition, 18; Causes of these changes, 19; The money power as a peril in this country, 20; The Knights of Labor, 21; The kind of workmen's societies needed in this country, 22.	
SAVONAROLA. By <i>Rev. R. Parsons, D.D.</i> ,	23
How the eloquent Dominican was brought into prominence, 23; Evil influence of the Renaissance in Italy, 24; Popularity turned Savonarola's head, 25; Carrying politics into the pulpit, 26; The would-be reformer on his own labors, 27; Savonarola and Pope Alexander VI., 28; The preacher's temporary retirement placed him at a great disadvantage, 29; A disciple's rashness brought both to ruin, 30; An ordeal that miscarried caused Savonarola's fall, 32; Trial of himself and two colleagues, 33; Condemnation and sentence, 34; Reflections on Savonarola's character, 35; He was no precursor of the "Reformation," 36; Why his sermons were placed on the Index, 38; Analysis of some of his productions, 39; Cantù's estimate of Savonarola, 41; What Philip de Commines and other contemporaries thought of him, 42.	
SCRIPTURE POETRY. By <i>Rev. Anthony J. Maas, S.J.</i> ,	44
Relation of the Hebrew poems to the sacred text, 44; Technical structure of Hebrew poetry, 45; Examples of the different kinds of parallelisms, 46; The natural stanzas of Hebrew poetry, 48; Signs of artistic design, 49; In what Hebrew rhythm consists, 50; Relation of sound-unit to rhythm, 51; Facts indicating the existence of Hebrew metre, 52; Vocal elements not the true unit of sound-rhythm, 53; Syllable quantity must be discarded, 54; The mooted systems allow too many licenses, 55; Canons of Syriac metre, 56; A few instances in illustration, 57; All the difficulties of Hebrew poetry have not been overcome, 59.	
LULWORTH CHAPEL, BISHOP CARROLL, AND BISHOP WALMESLEY. By <i>Rev. Thomas L. Kelly</i> ,	60
The certificate of Bishop Carroll's consecration, 60; How the Bishop-elect was invited to Lulworth, 61; Preparing for the consecration ceremonies, 62; Description and history of Lulworth Chapel, 63; Biographical sketch of Bishop Walmesley, 64; His long episcopal career and literary and scientific labors, 65; "Pastorini's," "History of the Church," 67; Trouble caused by the "Protestation" of Charles Butler and others, 68; The Bishops condemn the "Protestation Oath," 70; Close of Bishop Walmesley's long career, 71; Sketches of the priests who assisted at Bishop Carroll's consecration, 71.	
THE LAST FOUR YEARS IN BELGIUM. By <i>John A. Mooney</i> ,	73
Sketch of political parties in Belgium, 73; Reaction caused by the "Liberal" tyranny of 1879, 74; Undoing the mischief in 1884, 75; "Liberal" agitation against the latest school law, 76; Breaking off and restoring relations with the Holy See, 77; Financial reform by the Catholic ministry, 78; Giving the people a larger voice in their own government, 79; Extension of the franchise, 80; Attempts to reorganize the Radical-Liberal party, 82; They produce riot, incendiarism, etc., 83; Political side of strikes in Belgium, 84; The Catholic government's honest interest in the working classes, 86; The evil of alcoholism in Belgium, 87; But free love is even more hurtful to society, 88; Other elements of social evil in Belgium, 89; Making provision against external enemies also, 90; Interest of Belgian affairs for lovers of liberty, 91; Catholics should not pin their faith to any party or country, 93.	
BOSTONIAN IGNORANCE OF CATHOLIC DOCTRINE. By <i>John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.</i> ,	94
The treatment of Catholics in this country is a curious problem, 94; Catholic doctrine misrepresented in the public schools, 95; What Catholics have ever held an indulgence to mean, 96; A social and religious transformation going on in New England, 97; Characteristics of Protestantism, 98; Statistics of Catholic growth in	

	PAGE
New England, 99; How the change might look to the Puritan Fathers, 100; Survival of anti-Catholic prejudice in New England, 101; Rapid decline of Congregationalism, 102.	
PROGRESS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARNELL COMMISSION. By <i>John Boyle O'Reilly, LL.D.</i> ,	103
The O'Donnell libel suit and the famous Parnell letter, 103; Mr. Parnell's public disclaimer, 104; Origin and intent of the Parnell commission, 105; A packed and partisan tribunal, 106; Mr. Parnell's libel suit, 107; The Parnell Defence Fund, 108; The Commission showing steadfast partisanship against the Irish party, 109; The <i>Times</i> producing only the testimony of vile informers, 110; A ludicrous incident, 111; The Molloy hoax, 112; Two precious <i>Times</i> witnesses, 113; During the trial coercion becomes severe in Ireland, 114; At its highest point with the opening of the year 1889, 115; Mr. Parnell on the first period of the commission proceedings, 116.	
THE YEAR 1888—A RETROSPECT AND A PROSPECT. By <i>A. de G.</i> ,	117
Events influencing the inner life of civilization, 117; The Papal Jubilee easily takes the lead, 118; The great lesson it has taught, 119; Momentous events of the year in Germany, 120; The young emperor's visit to the Pope, 121; Brief reflections upon Austria's past, 122; Events in Russia, the United States and other countries, 123; The modern economic system, 124; What underlies the labor and other questions, 125; The sham and the real social reformers, 126; The Pope compels praise from his natural enemies, 127; The best preventive of social revolution, 128.	
THE CANADIAN SEPARATE SCHOOL SYSTEM. By <i>D. A. O'Sullivan, LL.D.</i> (Laval),	129
Advantages of a denominational over a State school system, 129; Parental and religious rights in education, 130; History of the denominational system in Canada, 131; Statistics and plan of separate schools in western Canada, 133; How the school monies are divided, 134; Progress of the Catholic separate schools for ten years, 135; Practically the system extends only to elementary schools, 136; But little supervision exercised by the educational department, 137.	
THE SO-CALLED PROBLEM OF EVIL—A PROTEST. By <i>Rev. M. A. Power, S.J.</i> ,	140
How to meet a youth with difficulties, 140; Solving the insoluble, 141; Great minds on the evil problem, 142; The modern poet, the psalmist, and common sense, 143; The modern spirit and the language of problems, 144; Out of touch with the modern spirit, 145; Mistaking verbal jugglery for logic, 144; The modern mind ill-fitted for philosophical problems, 145; Do moderners excel in reasoning powers? 146; The process that a sound critic is put through, 147; Importance of forming critics for the protection of philosophy, 148; Modern philosophers are a gullible set, 149; As are the critics so are the books to be criticised, 150; Obscurity of modern philosophy, 151; Works that mark an epoch in philosophical expression, 152.	
WHAT THE LANGUAGES OWE TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By <i>Brother Barbas</i> ,	153
Why there is a close connection between the Church and language, 153; The Catholic Church's office of teacher, 154; This mission as voiced by St. Paul, 156; The sentiment of the Church teaching, 157; The Church ever engaged in improving the languages, 158; What the English language owes to Catholic churchmen, 159; Latin as an element in English, 161; Adapting speech to practical purpose, 162; Learning in Europe during the Middle Ages, 163; Mediæval learning the creation of the Catholic Church, 164; Why she prescribes limit to thought, 165; Effect of arts and sciences on language, 166; How the Church has influenced precision of language, 167; Influence of the fathers and doctors of the Church, 168; The teaching of faith on the greatest of mysteries, 169; Analogy between the Divine mind and the human mind, 170; Philological vagaries of some modern writers, 171.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. D. T. O'Sullivan, S.J.</i> ,	172
The perfected phonograph, 172; Mars, 174; A new theory of spectrum analysis, 176; The theory of electro-magnetism, 177.	
MYTHS AND LEGENDS OF THE "REFORMATION." By <i>Prof. Charles G. Herbermann, Ph.D.</i> ,	193
Living interest in the history of Luther's movement, 193; Luther was by no means the first translator of the Bible, 194; A vain attempt to rehabilitate Luther, 196; The Bible in the Church before Luther, 197; Professor Brewer and others on the pre-"Reformation" clergy, 199; Trumped up charges against them, 201; How the "Reformation" was propagated, 203; Character of Luther's work in Germany, 204; Preaching before Luther's time, 206; The "Reformation" fatal to learning and education, 207; Luther and the Bible, 208; His relation to the German language, 209; Not the father of congregational singing, 210; Luther as a hymn composer, 211; The Church has no reason to fear impartial criticism, 212; The claims that historical science has on the attention of Catholics, 214; The duty of lay Catholics in the field of history, 215.	

Table of Contents.

v

	PAGE
THE TENDENCY OF ENGLISH JOURNALISM. By <i>Arthur F. Marshall, B.A.</i> (Oxon.),	216
The Church of England no longer an arbiter of Christian truths, 216; Journalism and the new Ritualism, 217; Even the secular journals have assumed infallibility, 218; Organs of the Low Church factions, 219; Classification of sectarian organs, 220; Religious liberalism among English Protestants, 221; Relation of secular teaching in the journals to religious impressions, 222; The social groove of English journalism, 223; Suppression of truth in party journalism, 224; Most journals are the slaves of advertisers, 225; Interest of certain journalists in skepticism, 227; What may be expected in the future, 228.	
A NEW BIOGRAPHER OF OUR LORD. By <i>J. I. Rodriguez</i> ,	229
Description of Gen. Lew Wallace's latest book, 229; Interesting plan of the work, 229; It is a contradiction of its own purposes, 231; Attachment to Christ because of His human nature, 232; The author's ignorance of the proper authorities, 233; Legends of the evangelic times, 234; Stories more edifying and instructive than those chosen by our author, 235; Absurdity of some of his conclusions, 236; The general tradition as to St. Joseph, 237; Assertions unsupported by evidence, 238; Schools in the East in the time of our Lord, 239; Treatment of the "Finding in the Temple," 241; Pity due to some dabblers in Christian teaching, 242.	
PROTESTANTISM AND ART. By <i>Peter L. Foy</i> ,	243
Result of the inventions and discoveries of the 15th century, 243; Effects of the fall of Constantinople, 244; Miniature painting the only exception to the rule of progress, 245; The golden age of Christian art, 246; The Sistine chapel as an artistic glory, 247; Hurlfulness of the "Reformation" to religious art, 248; Relation of art works to religious devotion, 249; Protestant vandalism in houses of worship, 250; Specific account of the wreck and ruin, 251; The ruin accompanying the religious change in England, 252; Why the England of to-day is not an artistic country, 254; Ruin marking the progress of the Calvinists, 255; The "Reformation" more radical and destructive on the continent, 256; Its ravages in the Netherlands, 257; Motley's picture of the havoc, 258; What happened in Switzerland, France and Scotland, 259; Even Catholic countries felt the force of the ravage, 260; The Cromwellian desolation in Ireland, 261; How Rome felt the force of the movement, 262; The religious wars and dynastic struggles of Europe, 263; The iconoclasm not confined to outward things, 264; Unexampled sterility of the "Reformation" on the side of art, 265; Protestantism contrasted with Buddhism, 266; The various forms in which Protestantism entered Italy, 267.	
"ROBERT ELSMERE" AS A CONTROVERSIAL NOVEL. By <i>Rt. Rev. J. de Concilio, D.D.</i> ,	268
The general tendency of Mrs. Ward's book, 268; Character of the personages introduced, 269; Superciliousness of Rationalists in treating of Christian evidences, 270; Perhaps the author intended to make an argument <i>ex absurdis</i> , 271; A discussion of Christian testimony, 272; An untenable philosophical position, 273; Infallible rules for two necessary conditions of argument, 274; Credulity of human testimony, 275; A method of argument that claims a monopoly of knowledge, 276; Its rules easily open to question, 277; Condition of the intellectual world when Christianity appeared, 278; Miracles and experience, 280; Evidence in favor of Christ's resurrection, 281; Again the probability of an argument <i>ex absurdo</i> , 282.	
THE PAPACY AS AN INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL. By <i>Mgr. Bernard O'Reilly, D.D.</i> ,	283
What it costs the European countries to maintain their armies, 283; A great work on the peace problem, 284; America's experience of the folly of war, 285; Temporary expedients against it, 286; Truths that every legislator should lay to heart, 287; Arbitration as a remedy, 288; its relation to international law, 289; Men who "builded better than they knew," 290; The present Pope's efforts in the direction of peace, 291; The Canadian difficulty, 292; The Carolinas incident, 293; Need of a school of international law in Rome, 294; Can we have an international tribunal, 295; Trespasses against the law of nations, 296; Necessity of a mediator demonstrated, 297; Lessons from antiquity, 298; And from the Middle Ages, 299; Evil results of religious schism, 300; Testimony adduced by Chateaubriand, 301; An idea that may bear fruit in the not distant future, 302.	
O'CONNELL'S CORRESPONDENCE. By <i>John MacCarthy</i> ,	303
The pleasure of reading Mr. Fitzpatrick's book, 303; O'Connell's idea of the people, 304; The contrast between O'Connell and Parnell, 305; Lecky's testimony to O'Connell's towering prominence, 306; A man reveals himself best in his letters, 307; O'Connell's experience of the French Revolution, 308; The key-note of his entire political career, 309; Beginning of the movement for Catholic emancipation, 310; O'Connell as a fighter, 311; The opposition to emancipation, 312; The "veto" difficulty, 313; Bishop Milner's noble stand, 314; Wringing emancipation out of the heart of the Government, 315; The Clare election, 316; The refusal to take the Test Oath, 317; The crowning point in O'Connell's career, 318; The folly of England in refusing Ireland's rights, 319; The Orange faction in Ireland incorrigible, 320; The cloud that hung over O'Connell's last days, 321.	
THE JESUIT ESTATES IN CANADA. By <i>John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.</i> ,	322
Rights guaranteed by the original cession to England, 322; Property owned by the Jesuits at that time, 323; The Quebec Act and other measures, 324; The Jesuit estates, Father Casot and Bishop Briand, 325; What happened on Father Casot's death, 326; Claim of the Church to the old Jesuit College of Quebec, 327; Re-es-	

	PAGE
<p>tablishment of the Society of Jesus, 328; A division of opinion among Catholics as well as Protestants, 329; Pushing the case to a settlement in Quebec, 330; An old calumny revived and refuted, 331; Vain attempts to prevent separation, 332; Removing an old landmark, 333.</p>	
<p>TRIPLE ORDER OF SCIENCE—PHYSICS, METAPHYSICS AND FAITH. By <i>Rev. W. Poland, S.J.</i>,</p>	334
<p>The part that physics plays, 334; Hypothetical geology, 335; The theory of evolution, 336; Plato smiled at by modern scientists, 337; The "Scientists" of the higher knowledge, 338; Their arrogance illustrated, 339; The value of a code of laws for the pursuit of truth, 340; An apt quotation from Sir J. W. Dawson, 341.</p>	
<p>NOTES OF A CATHOLIC TOURIST IN CENTRAL EUROPE. By <i>Prof. St. George Mivart, F.R.S.</i>,</p>	342
<p>From London to Basle, 342; Berne and Interlaken, 343; Unterwalden and its republican saint, 344; On the way to Andermatt, 345; The Capuchins at home, 346; Religious services described, 347; Einsiedeln and its sights, 348; Zurich and Constance, 349; From Bregenz to Lindau, 351; Incidents in Bavaria's capital, 352; Religious life in Munich, 353; Visiting Salzburg, Augsburg and other places, 354; At Ulm, 355; Stuttgart and Cologne, 356; Striking features of the Rome of the Rhine, 357.</p>	
<p>THE OBJECTIVITY OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE. By <i>Rev. William A. Fletcher</i>,</p>	358
<p>Errors arising from ignorance of man's nature, 358; Objective evidence manifesting itself subjectively, 359; The subjective supposes the objective order, 360; Havoc of false teaching in the sphere of morality, 361; Weight of proof for the objective character of our knowledge, 363.</p>	
<p>SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. D. T. O'Sullivan, S.J.</i>,</p>	364
<p>Cobalt, nickel, and their new associate, 364; Electric railroads, 365; Aluminium and the Heroult process, 369; Bellite, 370.</p>	
<p>CATHOLICITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS. By <i>Rev. Alfred Young, C.S.P.</i>,</p>	387
<p>Complaint of the Church against her opponents, 387; The question of God at the bottom of all questions, 388; Man could not originate the idea of authority, 389; Man's departure from the original revelation, 390; Human nature and civilization, 391; The best human civilization bears the seeds of decay, 392; Would-be regenerators come to grief, 393; Proudhon's blasphemies, 394; The just deserts of modern revolvers, 395; To affirm a truth requires an act of self-denial, 396; Explanation of the prevailing taste for the absurd, 397; The issue is between the supremacy of the Divine and the human word, 398; How the Church stands to the world, 399; The deductions of reason and the language of mankind, 400; Human tyranny and Divine authority, 401; Arrogance bred in mankind by original sin, 402; Influence of doctrine on the social condition of nations, 403; On what the Church's infallibility depends, 404; Idolatry of the intellect breeds illogical reasoning, 405; Humility a characteristic of Catholic scholars, 406; Why the princes of modern science are envious of God's authority, 407; The strongest proof in favor of the Church, 408; The Cross has conquered and will ever conquer, 409.</p>	
<p>THE POPES OF THE RENAISSANCE AND THEIR LATEST HISTORIANS. By <i>John A. Mooney</i>,</p>	410
<p>The various historians of the Popes, 410; The modern revival of historical studies, 411; Insularity of modern English historians, 412; Creighton's "History of the Papacy" but a superficial work, 413; Lord Acton's estimate of the work, 414; Defects of the "Introduction," 415; Its two chief critics compared, 416; How Pastor differs from both Ranke and Creighton, 417; Ranke's self-conceit and prejudice, 418; In Pastor the man gives way to the historian, 419; Character of his "Introduction," 420; The "Renaissance" period a favorite study of late, 421; The bad use made of its new learning, 423; The liberty of the Church identical with the freedom of mankind, 424; Character of the Avignon Popes, 425; Beginning of the Great Schism of the West, 426; The world of that time was a queer one, 427; Rome without the Popes, 428; Nicholas V. made Rome the centre of Christendom, 429; Value of a knowledge of diplomacy to the historian, 430; Opposition of the Popes to Islamism and to absolutism in rulers, 431; History writing has been unjust to the Church, 432; Are we to have a learned school of Catholic American historians? 433.</p>	
<p>ABELARD. By <i>Rev. R. Parsons, D.D.</i>,</p>	434
<p>In what respect Abelard is best known, 434; How he became the captive of Heloise, 435; Their marriage, 436; How Abelard became a monk and was unhappy, 437; Made Abbot of St. Gildas de Ruys, 438; Sickening sentimentality about Abelard and Heloise, 439; The letters attributed to her not genuine, 440; Abelard's errors of doctrine, 442; St. Bernard's interest in his behalf, 443; Abelard's errors condemned by the Pope, 444; Summary of these errors, 445; Were they ascribed to him through ignorance, 446; Unjustly stigmatized as a heretic, 447.</p>	
<p>PROF. MAX MÜLLER ON LANGUAGE AND THOUGHT. By <i>Rev. Anthony J. Maas, S.J.</i>,</p>	449
<p>The three principles of the theory of "The Science of Thought," 449; The limitations with which Prof. Müller's theory is proposed, 450; Relation of language to thought, 451; Logical grounds taken by those who oppose him, 452; Various positions he has taken at different periods, 453; Taking liberties with both language and logic, 454; The new theory not yet perfected by its author, 455; The professor indulges in both gossip and more weighty vagaries, 456; Complaining of Kant being now neglected, 457; Prof. Müller and the schoolmen, 458; Traditionalism, 459; What scholastic philosophy will concede to the professor, 461.</p>	

Table of Contents.

vii

	PAGE
THE CHURCH OF THE ATTAKAPAS—1750-1889. By <i>M. A. C.</i> ,	462
Memories awakened by Père Jan's death, 462; The first white men among the Attakapas, 463; Belle Isle's romantic story, 464; How the Attakapas were converted from cannibalism, 466; The story of the Acadian exiles, 467; Condition of New Orleans at that time, 468; The Acadians in Louisiana, 469; St. Martinsville, 470; Character of the Acadian colony in Louisiana, 471; Their earliest church registers, 472; The first bishop in Louisiana, 473; And the first at the "Poste des Attakapas," 474; Louisiana barren of vocations to the priesthood, 476; Father Isabey's mission, 477; His immediate successors, 478; Sketch of Père Jan's early life, 479; At Nantes, 480; Affiliated to the Trappists, and then brought to America by Archbishop Blanc, 481; His life at St. Martinsville, 482; Loneliness of his later years, 483; The poetry and romance of the Attakapas country, 484; Quietude of St. Martinsville, 485; Its reminders of Evangeline, 486.	
THE CONVERSION OF THE NORTHMEN. By <i>Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.</i> , . .	487
Rome, Iceland, and the Norse Church in America, 487; Origin and early religion of the Northmen, 489; Their principal gods, 490; Their hereditary fatalism, 491; How the Scandinavian gods were worshipped, 492; Practical effect of the religion of the Northmen upon their character and conduct, 493; Difficulties in the way of their conversion to Christianity, 496; Relation of the Roman Pontiffs to the northern converts, 497; The part taken by the early Christian kings in the historic progress of the Church, 498; St. Ausgar, the Great Apostle of the North, 499; Introduction of Christianity into Norway, 500; Character of King Olaf and his methods, 501; Conversion of the Icelanders, 503; Career and end of King St. Olaf of Norway, 504.	
PROFESSOR FISHER ON "UNSECTARIANISM" IN THE COMMON SCHOOLS. By <i>Brother Barbas</i> ,	505
Professor Fisher's criticism of Cardinal Manning, 505; Denominational education an old American principle, 506; The Cardinal's nationality has nothing to do with his logic, 507; Undenominationalism is only a new religion, 508; Professor Fisher's statements abound in contradictions, 509; How he would stand in reference to the Declaration of Independence, 510; Family rights take precedence of those of the State, 511; The moral right of the clergy, 512; The principle of no taxation without representation, 513; Desperate bolstering up of a limping cause, 514; A clap-trap appeal to politicians, 515.	
THE ANGLICAN BISHOP OF LINCOLN. By <i>Arthur F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)</i> , . .	516
Absurdity of the recent trial of the Bishop of Lincoln, 516; What the Church of England was in 1839, 517; Almost the only Protestant heresy there is, 518; Was the Anglican Church of 1839 the same as that of 1889? 519; The line the Bishop of Lincoln has taken, 520; Tenableness of his position, 521; The real importance of the trial, 522; Views expressed in newspapers, 523; Relation of the case to Ritualism and Low Churchism, 525; What would happen in case the Bishop were condemned, 526; His case may lead many to the Catholic Church, 527; The question of a living Divine authority, 528; A <i>reductio ad absurdum</i> , 529; A trial that would have been impossible fifty years ago, 530; The pith of the case, 532.	
JANSENISTS, OLD CATHOLICS, AND THEIR FRIENDS IN AMERICA. By <i>John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.</i> ,	533
Sketch of the Jansenist Church of Utrecht, 533; Relation to it of religious disturbances in America, 534; A recent farcical imitation of it in the West, 535; The romantic story of René Vilatte, 536; Bishop Brown's lack of truth and honesty, 537; Some curious prayer books, 538; Their contradictory teaching, 539; Difficulties of the Green Bay mission, 540; Why Vilatte's case is a peculiar one, 541.	
THE FORTHCOMING CATHOLIC CONGRESS. By <i>Peter L. Foy</i> ,	542
Origin of the scheme of holding the Congress, 542; The plan of organization and programme for it, 543; Why it should discuss the actual position of the Papacy, 544; Influence of the voice of such a gathering, 545; Why the memory of historic Italy is cherished by Catholics, 546; Bad effects of preserving some national traits, 547; The principle of nationality acting as a solvent, 548; The Papacy as a defender of Italy, 549; The most interesting work set for the Congress, 550; Secondary causes of the Church's growth in America, 551.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. D. T. O'Sullivan, S.J.</i> ,	552
Photography, 552; Forests and rainfall, 556; Origin of petroleum, 559.	
THE STRUGGLE FOR CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS IN FRANCE. By <i>Mgr. Bernard O'Reilly, D.D.</i> ,	577
Opposing views of Guizot and Jules Ferry on education, 577; Count de Mun's retort to Ferry, 578; The outlook for Christian education in France, 579; Origin of the present struggle for the schools, 580; Class legislation against the religious orders, 582; Close of the Jesuit and other schools, 583; Unavailing protests of the Catholics, 585; Efforts to gain control of the elementary schools, 586; Completely centralizing control of the schools, 587; Stunning effrontery of Ferry's statistics, 588; M. de Mun's refutation, 591; Ferry as a whipped cur, 592; An overwhelming outburst of eloquence, 593; Clinching the <i>argumentum ad hominem</i> , 594; Was Gambetta put out of the way, 595; An intolerable radical dictatorship, 596; The crisis in France is of supreme gravity, 597.	

	PAGE
THE FIRST CHRISTIAN NORTHMEN IN AMERICA. By <i>Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.</i> ,	598
When Greenland was discovered, 598; Bull of Pope Gregory IV., 599; The Bollandists on the document, 601; Jurisdiction of St. Ansgar, 602; The first vestige of Christianity in the western hemisphere, 603; The first Christian in the New World, 604; Lief Ericson's voyages, 605; The first Catholic church erected on this continent, 606; This followed by many others, 607; The history of Gudrid, 608; An incident of the time when Christianity was yet new in Greenland, 609; A ghost story, 611; The later history of Gudrid, 613; A passage characteristic of the national sentiment of the Northmen, 614; Some descendants of the first native American Christian, 615.	
THE HOLY SEE AND THE GENTILES. By <i>M. T. Allies</i> ,	616
The present tendency towards original research, 616; Mr. Allies on the old and the new Rome, 617; Byzantium's jealousy of the ancient capital, 618; Unsatisfied ambition developing into schism, 619; Creative power of the Popes in old Rome, 620; The miracle of Rome converting the barbarians, 621; Capital importance of Mr. Allies' latest work, 623.	
THE UNIAT CATHOLICS IN RUSSIA. By <i>Bryan J. Clinch</i> ,	624
Peculiar character of the Catholic Church in ancient Poland, 624; The Uniates then more numerous than their Latin brethren, 625; Russian iniquity in the partition of Poland, 626; Toleration under the Emperors Paul and Alexander I., 627; The Catholic college of St. Petersburg, 628; Siemasko's Machiavellian perfidy, 629; How he went about his ruinous work, 630; Official "union" of the Uniates with the Russian state Church, 631; Enforcing attendance at schismatic worship, 632; Fate of the priests who refused to change their faith, 633; Heart-rending story of suffering by the nuns of Minsk, 634; Sister Macrina's own story, 635; Fidelity of the masses of the Uniates, 637.	
RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO HUMAN PROGRESS. By <i>Rev. H. A. Brann, D.D.</i> ,	639
Proud position of the Catholic Church in this country, 639; The question here is of the human side of the Church, 640; She is at least as free from scandals now as at any period of her history, 641; Comparison with the early Middle Ages, 642; And with the 11th and 12th centuries, 643; During the "Reformation" period, 644; Scandals were then even worse in Italy than elsewhere, 645; Particular instances of depravity in various countries, 646; Deporable pictures drawn by Catholic historians, 647; The Church now comparatively free from the evils of former times, 648; Causes of the improvement in the external life of the Church, 649; Change in the mode of training the clergy, 650; Good results of the destruction of feudal patronage, 651; We should be thankful for the present condition, 652.	
THE RELATIVITY OF OUR KNOWLEDGE. By <i>Rev. F. H. Nash</i> ,	653
Why our knowledge cannot be merely subjective or relative, 653; The theory of relativity is a gratuitous assumption, 654; Contradictions of the theories of modern philosophers, 655; Why our knowledge is altogether objective, 656; Representation and the testimony of the senses, 657; The soundest theory of knowledge, 658; Absurdity of the expression, "relativity of knowledge," 659.	
MONT SAINT MICHEL—CHURCH, ABBEY AND FORTRESS. By <i>M. A. J.</i> ,	660
Simplicity, truth and power are the higher architectural virtues, 660; Modern representations of the olden monuments, 661; Thoughts awakened by Mont Saint Michel—its origin, 662; Saint Aubert and King Childebert II., 663; The Archangel Michael honored among the Normans, 664; Various royal visitors to the Mount, 665; How Mont St. Michel fared in the Middle Ages, 666; More than once a victim of the elements, 667; Labors and disappointments of the monks, 669; And it suffered from siege, too, 670; The monastery turned into a prison, 671; Changes in the architectural details of the buildings, 672; "La Merveille," a name well deserved, 673; The largest, if not the grandest, Gothic room in the world, 675; A century flooded with a holy light, 676; The Philistine's of to-day, 677; The traditions of the monks cannot be wholly lost, 678.	
WILL THE POPE LEAVE ROME? By <i>Arthur F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)</i> ,	679
Why the Pope's enemies wish he would leave Rome, 679; The Christian Rome and the city of God, 680; The lesson of eighteen centuries of Catholic belief, 681; Divine authority is a fact, not a dream, 682; The conflicts of the world with pontifical Rome, 683; The Pope's person and office divinely associated with the Holy See, 684; Recognition of the Pope by modern powers, 685; The Pope as an arbitrator between the nations, 688; Rome the centre of stability, from the very nature of things, 690.	
THE COLUMBUS CENTENARY OF 1892. By <i>John Gilmory Shea, LL.D.</i> ,	691
Columbus' preparation for his great exploit, 691; Relics of him should be prominent at the coming exposition, 692; The Catholic Church should have a special exhibit, 693; Memories of Catholic pioneers in the United States, 694; Some of the more illustrious explorers, 695; Where personal relics of Columbus may be obtained, 696; The earliest books on America, 697; There should be an exhibit of educational and eleemosynary institutions, 698; How to make the exposition a success, 699; The duty that Catholics owe to themselves in this case, 700.	
THE FACULTY OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY. By <i>Prof. Charles G. Herbermann, Ph.D.</i> ,	701
The material success of the University has been brilliant, 701; The faculty and the chancellor, 702; The rector and the vice-rector, 703; The professor of dogmatic theology, 704; Of Biblical science, 705; Of English literature, 706; The	

Table of Contents.

ix

	PAGE
director of discipline, 707; The department of philosophy, 708; The chair of canon law, 709; Of moral theology, 710; Lecturer on Church history, 711; And on astronomy and physics, 712; The views that guided the trustees in making their selections, 713; European scholars in our great schools, 714; A faculty of whose scholarship and Americanism we may well feel proud, 715.	
GIORDANO BRUNO. By <i>John A. Mooney</i> ,	716
Materials for a life of Bruno, 716; His early life until his ordination, 717; Giving trouble as a Dominican, he becomes a wanderer, 718; Among the "Saints" of Geneva, 719; Something that looks like monumental lying, 720; Our hero's queer pranks in Paris, 721; Characteristic self-laudation, 722; Personifying presumption itself, 723; An affected Copernican and a worse than heretic, 724; A brief term at Oxford, and again at Paris, 725; Giordano at this time was anything but a Christian, 726; One whose talent was to feign, 727; Excommunicated by the Lutheran Church, 728; Arrest and trial at Venice, 729; Summary of Bruno's strange opinions on religion and morals, 730; A "philosophical heretic and religious hypocrite," 731; Transferred to Rome, and his treatment there, 732; He was treated even as his own logic dictated, 733; In spite of his mental abilities and moral qualities, he was unknown among his contemporaries, 734; They are only fools who honor him, 735; A second-hand excubitor of worn-out theories, 736; A monument that is a sign of shame to the Christian world, 737.	
IN MEMORIAM—MONSIGNOR CORCORAN. By <i>Rt. Rev. John J. Keane, D.D.</i> ,	738
Those who lament Mgr. Corcoran's death and have the best reason to do so, 738; As editor of this REVIEW his loss is most heavily felt, 739; Extent of his knowledge and his power of expression, 740; Comparison of his character with that of Dr. Brownson, 741; The Holy Scriptures was his study of predilection, 742; Exceptionally well-equipped for the work of a reviewer, 743; His was a character naturally incapable of human respect, 744; Writings of his that give us a delightful insight of his nature, 745; The motive and inspiration of his life, 746; His name and fame should be an inspiration to every young ecclesiastic, 747.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. D. T. O'Sullivan, S.J.</i> ,	748
The Weems Electric Railway, 748; National Electric Light Association, 749; Improved system of cable telegraph, 751; Quartz fibres, 752; Minor notes—Central electric stations, the Eiffel tower, gnomium, 754	

BOOK NOTICES.

American Commonwealth (Bryce).....	183	Lives of the Fathers (Farrar).....	562
American Ecclesiastical Review.....	192	Logic (Clarke).....	375
Ancient Rome (Lancelotti).....	379	Lourdes (Clarke).....	192
Apostleship of Prayer (Ramière).....	575	Manual of Prayers.....	569
Aroër; The Story of a Vacation.....	192	Manuals of Catholic Philosophy (Stony-	
Authority (Rivington).....	757	hurst Series).....	375, 574
Birth of the Republic (Goodloe).....	762	Memoir of Rev. Francis A. Baker (Hewitt),	386
Book of Superiors (McMahon).....	386	Miscellanies, Vol. III. (Manning).....	190
Camplon: A Tragedy (Longhaye).....	576	Modern Science in Bible Lands (Dawson).....	765
Castle, The, and the Manor (Winter).....	576	Moral Philosophy (Rickaby).....	574
Catholic Claims (Richardson).....	757	Mores Catholici (Digby).....	767
Catholic Family Annual for 1890 (Illustrated).....	768	Narrative and Critical History of America	
Catholic Hierarchy Deposed by Queen Elizabeth (Bridgett and Knox).....	760	(Winsor).....	179, 372
Catholic Worship (Glaser).....	192	New Sunday-School Companion.....	381
Characteristics from Archbishop Ullathorne's Writings.....	192, 386	Old English Catholic Missions (Payne)....	573
Church History (Kurtz).....	572, 768	Papers of the American Society of Church History.....	571
Constitutiones Catholice Universitatis Americae.....	574	Parnell Movement (O'Connor).....	765
Dependence (Rivington).....	757	Records of the English Catholics of 1715 (Payne).....	192, 385
Elements of Ecclesiastical Law (Smith),	565	Religious State, The (St. Liguori).....	575
Explanation of the Constitution of the United States (Furey).....	574, 767	Roman Hymnal (Young).....	576
First Principles of Knowledge (Rickaby),	375	Rudiments of Hebrew Grammar (Gabriels).....	382
Frederick, Crown Prince and Emperor (Rodd).....	377	Sacred Heart Library (Dewey).....	575
From the World to the Cloister.....	192	Sermons at Mass (O'Keefe).....	192
George Washington (Lodge).....	762	Sermons of Padre Agostino da Montefeltro.....	192
Germany's Debt to Ireland (Stang).....	768	Seven Thousand Words Often Mispronounced (Phyfe).....	767
God Knowable and Known (Ronayne)....	189	Short Cut to the True Church (Hill).....	765
Golden Words (A Kemps and Hamilton),	576	Short Instructions for Low Masses (Donahoe).....	383
Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries (Gasquet).....	568	Short Instructive Sketches from the Lives of the Saints.....	382
History of Confession (Guillois and De Goesbriand).....	384	Six Sermons on Devotion to the Sacred Heart.....	192
Institutiones Logicales (Pesch).....	763	Socialisme d'Etat et La Réforme Sociale (Jannet).....	560
Introductio in Corpus Juris Canonici (Laurin).....	766	St. Basil's Hymnal.....	575
Ireland, The Pope and (McCormick).....	574	St. Gertrude Manual.....	576
Kant's Critical Philosophy (Mahaffy and Bernard).....	764	St. Patrick, the Father of a Sacred Nation (Loughlin).....	384
Leaves from St. John Chrysostom (Allies),	192, 383	Sweet Thoughts of Jesus and Mary (Carre),	764
Leaves from the Annals of the Sisters of Mercy.....	573	Swiss Confederation (Adams and Cunningham).....	759
Lectures on English Literature (Egan),	575	Testimony of Justin Martyr (Purves).....	567
Letters to Persons in Religion (St. Francis de Sales).....	192, 386	The Holy Mass (St. Liguori).....	576
Life and Glories of St. Joseph (Moreno and Thompson).....	385	The New Sunday-School Companion.....	381
Life and Writings of Bishop McMullen (McGovern).....	385	Theologice Dogmaticæ Compendium (Hurter).....	188
Life of Blessed Martin de Porres.....	192	Thomæ à Kempis de Imitatione Christi (Gerlach).....	766
Life of Lady Georgiana Fullerton.....	192	Thoughts and Counsels for Young Men (Von Doss).....	766
Life of St. Bonaventure (Skey).....	768	True Spouse of Jesus Christ (St. Liguori),	185
Life of St. Ignatius of Loyola (Genelli),	191	Wandering Knight, The (Carthenay).....	381
Little Book of Superiors (McMahon).....	386	Ward, William George, and the Oxford Movement.....	755
Liturgy for the Laity (O'Donnell).....	384		

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—JANUARY, 1889.—No. 53.

LAND AND LABOR IN FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES.

La Fin d'un Monde; par Edouard Drumont.

Les Etats-Unis Contemporains; par Claudio Jannet. 4th edition.

La Réforme Sociale; Bulletin de la Société d'Economie Sociale (January to December, 1888).

IN an admirable discourse delivered last summer before the united societies of Social Economy and *Les Unions de la Paix Sociale*, M. Claudio Jannet summed up all the conclusions which he embodies in the last edition of his great book on the United States. A devoted and practical Catholic, an enlightened student and admirer of our country, M. Jannet is eminently fitted to pronounce on our institutions and our people, on our present social and economical condition, as well as on our future dangers and prospects, a judgment that should commend itself to American statesmen and publicists.

"What is specially characteristic," he says, "of the situation of the United States is that, while the political situation has improved, the social question, on the contrary, has assumed a degree of intense acuteness greater even, if that be possible, than anything known in this old European world of ours. The inequality of conditions develops itself, step by step, in accordance with the progress of American society. This is a law which all societies obey; it is not in itself an evil; it is a fact which we here record."

VOL. XIV.—I

We shall see, in the course of this article, with what a judicial, but still kindly, impartiality this eminent professor of political economy in the Catholic University of Paris points out the evils and dangers arising from the present state of the land and labor question in our Republic, as well as the remedies and safeguards which Providence places within our reach.

As to France—and what is said of France applies in a great measure to all continental Europe,—we may take the information furnished us by another eminent Catholic, a devoted and practical Catholic, who wields his pen and exposes his life with the chivalric fearlessness of the French crusaders of old.

If M. Jannet, in his writings and his private life, might serve as a type of the old time *magistrature* of the best epoch, M. Drumont is no unworthy representative of his Breton forefathers, who fought in Palestine under Louis VII. and Louis IX., or followed George Cadoudal and his heroic *Chouans*. If his terrible pen spares no class, no living names in the cowardly, time-serving, mammon-worshipping, corrupt and corrupting French society of to-day, he only does what the patriotic Swiss Catholic did, what more than one of the old Crusaders had done,—seized a bundle of spears aimed at his fellow-soldiers by the foe, and pressed them into his own devoted breast. He hopes that others, more happy, will rush in after him through the breach thus opened in the enemy's ranks, and help save France from the hosts of Antichrist.

Let us see, first, what the author of *La Fin d'un Monde* has to say about the social question, about land and labor in his own country. We shall then follow M. Jannet in his instructive analysis of our own social condition.

I.

How often have we heard from the lips of Catholic scholars, and read in works now classical, the statement that the French Revolution of 1789 conferred at least one unquestionable benefit on the French popular masses,—that of creating millions of small landed proprietors, instead of the few thousands of nobles who, before 1789–1793, held the soil of France as their inheritance! This sole benefit we have heard set off, in 1870, a few years ago, as a compensation for much of the destruction wrought by the revolutionary convulsion in the ancient French monarchy.

The fact is that the National Convention, in confiscating the property of the French landlord class, acted on the same principle on which James I., Charles I. and his unscrupulous minister, Wentworth, and the Long Parliament under the Commonwealth, acted in confiscating every foot of Irish soil and selling it to "adventurers." Cromwell did for his soldiers what English kings and

parliaments had done before him,—divided the land of the Irish Catholics and Protestant loyalists among them, and drove beyond the Shannon all of the old native owners whom he could not exterminate.

The ancient Irish land-laws, either before St. Patrick or after him, never attributed to or acknowledged in the chiefs who bore the title of kings the right to hold, singly or collectively, the whole soil of the island as their own. This was the claim of the feudal sovereigns, which essentially differed from the proprietary right which obtained in Ireland.

There each tribe or clan held the territory, its patrimonial territory, as its own. The tribal chief, who was elective, as were the higher chieftains or kings, was allotted a certain portion of land for his own use. But of this he only had the *use*, not the ownership. He could no more barter it away, or hand it down as an heirloom to his sons or kinsfolk, than he could any other thing not his own.

Hence the outcry raised, when the first Irish chieftains were induced to make their submission to Henry VIII., and to accept from him the titles of earls or barons, together with the investiture of their lands, which they were thenceforward to hold as fiefs from the sovereign. The people protested that the land was not the chief's to transfer to the king, or to hold from him. It was, they said, and truly said, the property of the whole clan, solely and inalienably.

And this protestation, which even English historians note as just and unanswerable, was again and again renewed, when the new earls and barons, growing weary of their vassalage, revolted, were attainted, and saw their lands escheated, or forfeited to the crown. Their people protested that the rebels might rightly lose their titles or their lives in punishment of their treason to the liege-lord they had chosen; but that the attainder could not reach or affect *the land*, which never belonged to the rebels, and never could be forfeited by those who did not own it.

We have made this statement to show that the ancient land-laws of Ireland essentially differed from those of England, from those of France and of most of the continental countries, where the feudal system prevailed.

But, without at all entering into the right or wrong of the *expropriation* or "nationalization" of land, as decreed by the French Constituent Assembly and its successor, the National Convention, we must here meet, with a peremptory denial, the assertion, so confidently made and so universally believed, that the French Revolution created a large class of small farmer proprie-

tors, who took the place of the former landed aristocracy, dispossessed from 1789 to 1792.

Let us, on this most interesting question, hear what M. Drumont and the authorities he quotes have to say :

"What is most astonishing," he writes, "is to see our middle-class Conservatives (*Conservateurs bourgeois*) shrugging their shoulders, and to hear their indignant outcries, when one presumes to discuss, in their presence, the principle of property, especially when one remembers that this French middle-class (*bourgeoisie*) are now living, in a great measure, on the fruits of the most monstrous, brutal, and bloody appropriation that the world has ever witnessed. These middle-class men, whom the very term of 'nationalization of the soil' throws into a violent fit, forget that such a 'nationalization' has already taken place within the present century. Only, far from turning out to be profitable to the entire nation,—a result which never could have been an excuse for the horrible conditions under which it was effected—this 'nationalization' benefited none but the middle class, a fact which should prevent them from uttering such loud protestations.

"One hundred years have not yet passed by since we have seen applied to the whole of France the very theories which, as formulated by the Anarchists of our day, strike the most indulgent minds as something frightful. . . .

"People have generally accepted, and I have myself believed as Gospel-truth, the formulated assertion, 'the Revolution gave back the land to the peasants.'

"The assertion is an absolute falsehood, and socialistic writers, as well as official economists, at present agree in acknowledging its inaccuracy. 'Letrosne informs us,' says Michelet, 'that when Turgot became minister, the one-fourth of the soil belonged to those who tilled it.' In our day, on the contrary, all statistics go to prove that the small farmers do not own one-eighth of the land cultivated.¹

"Of 14,000,000 of registered land-properties, 61 per cent., that is 8,600,000, include only a total of 2,574,589 *hectares* (each hectare being over two acres) of taxable soil in a grand total of 49,338,304 hectares, that is, only 5.19 per cent. ; whereas, the holdings of large proprietors owning fifty hectares and above, with 122,000 registered titles, comprise nearly 18,000,000 of hectares, or more than 5 per cent. of the national arable territory."

Toubeau, in his *Impôt métrique*, and the journal *La terre aux Paysans* (Maurice, editor, 1885), furnish us with the following table :

¹ See Chirac, *La Prochaine Révolution*, and *La Revue Socialiste* of February 15th, 1887.

	Hectares.
Lands not owned by those who till them: woods, forests, waste lands, marshes, fallows, grazing lands and pasturages,	16,000,000.
Lands tilled on the half-profit system,	4,000,000.
Lands tilled by tenant-farmers,	12,000,000.
49,000 holdings of more than 100 hectares cultivated by farm-laborers,	12,000,000.
Houses, out-buildings, orchards, nurseries, gardens,	1,000,000.

"Total, 45,000,000 of hectares to be subtracted from 49,000,000 ; remainder for small farmer-proprietors, 4,000,000 of hectares.

"The share of this latter class is, therefore, *less than one-ninth*.

"The truth is, as we are told by the authors of *The Land Question*, MM. R. Meyer and G. Ardant, that the French Revolution neither created small proprietors nor destroyed large landed proprietors. It only called forth from another social class men who bought up the old lordships or who built up with their money new and wide domains. To the territorial nobility succeeded the land-owning middle class (*Bourgeoisie*). The former was only invested with the *dominium directum* (the direct ownership, without the *use* of the soil); the latter enjoys, over and above this, the *dominium utile*. Moreover, the new proprietary class in France have added to the property once held by the ancient nobility a very large portion of the lands and tenements belonging to the Church corporations, and, during the century last past, they have still further increased their property by purchases from small farmers. In the absence of statistics, this fact is made evident by personal observation.

"So, then, the large-landed proprietary class possess more.¹

"The French Revolution has benefited some people, since, according to M. Fernand Maurice, the Rothschilds now own 200,000 hectares (between 400,000 and 500,000 acres) of the lands of France, more than the nobles did a century ago; and the title on which it

¹ The author of a deeply interesting volume, *La Réforme agraire et la misère en France* ("Land Reform and Poverty in France"), M. Fernand Maurice, refutes, in nearly the same terms, the legend of the lands having been given to the peasants by the Revolution:

"Just as the land existed before 1789, just so do we find it a century thereafter. The farmer has kept hold of his cottage and of the garden attached to it; this is the progress. The other 3,500,000 farm-laborers have not even gained the right to have a roof of their own, no matter how wretched. For it must not be forgotten that, alongside the 3,000,400 small proprietors of holdings of less than ten acres (5 *hectares*), who are mostly obliged to work for others, agriculture employs also 3,500,000 laborers, real proletarians these, who have only their stout arms to win bread for their families.

"This explains why the farm-laborers emigrate, why the soil remains uncultivated, and why, from 1831 to 1881, 6,000,000 of persons have forsaken the country for the cities."

is wrongfully held is more absolute and more simple than it had ever been since the Roman period."¹

Passing to the use the *bourgeoisie*, or new landlord class in France, made of their power, M. Drumont says that they began by persuading the people, the laboring classes in town and country, that *they*, the people, it was who had done all that was wrong in the Revolution.

"This was just as untrue," he says, "as was the legend of the land given back to the peasants by the Revolution. The men dressed in fish-women's clothes, whom Choderlos de Laclos, the agent of the Duke of Orleans, hurled against Versailles in October (1789), the men armed with pikes, . . . the active *sans-culottes* who composed the Terrorist army, never counted more than 2000 or 3000 persons in France; and these were recruited from among men who had lost caste, or who were convicted malefactors, rather than from the ranks of the people.

"Just when the Revolutionists were finally suppressing all corporations, the laboring classes made a formidable protestation against the act. On June 10th, 1790, five thousand shoemakers met in the Champs Elysées; and the carpenters grouped themselves about the Archbishop's residence. The masons, slaters, and printers assembled at other places in the city. Bailly, Mayor of Paris, who was rightfully guillotined for having shot down the people when he was in power, and who excited the people to rebel when he was out of office, . . . said to the assembled tradesmen: 'As men, you possess every right, especially that of starving. . . .' A combination of workingmen to obtain uniform wages, and to compel their fellow-workmen to accept the rate of wages thus fixed, would be a coalition injurious to their own interests. It would be a violation of the law, an upsetting of public order, a serious injury to the general welfare."

"This," M. Drumont goes on to say, "is just what those in power to-day in France, the *bourgeoisie* of 1889, are just doing over again."

After having been mocked by Bailly, the tradesmen petitioned the National Assembly. There all meetings of workingmen and tradesmen are declared to be unconstitutional, inasmuch as corporations have been legally abolished.

A little later the Committee of Public Safety decreed that all workingmen who dared to unite to demand an increase of wages should forthwith be sent before the Revolutionary Tribunal—that is, to the guillotine!

Not till the reign of Napoleon III. were workingmen in France allowed to associate or to strike for higher wages.

¹ *La Fin d'un Monde*, Book I., pp. 3-6.

Furthermore, it is now well ascertained that the people, the true people, both in the cities and in the country-places, were almost unanimously opposed to the Revolution. And M. Drumont quotes, in proof of this, statistics published by that excellent workingmen's journal published in Paris, *La Corporation*, going to show that out of 12,000 persons condemned to death by the guillotine, and whose names and professions are well ascertained—7545 were men of the people—peasants, farm-laborers, workmen, servants.

And it was the popular masses who were sent by the Convention, and afterwards by Bonaparte, to fill the Revolutionary and Imperial armies, and to die on all the battle-fields of Europe.

Not till the old and victimized popular generation had disappeared were the all-powerful *bourgeoisie*, through the public press, able to convince the younger generation that the Revolution was the work of the people. Then the *prolétaires* or non-proprietary classes began to work for the middle-class who now owned the land and gathered the golden harvest, and to secure to them the possession of their ill-gotten power and wealth.

The men who filled the National Convention in the last days of its reign had all cheaply purchased their broad acres and warmly feathered their nests. They decreed that the old custom of confiscating property, as a punishment for enormous crime, should be done away with, as a relic of medieval barbarism!

They thus secured their own estates against all future accidents.

The restored Bourbons sanctioned all that 1793 had done, by refraining from troubling the new possessors. So that the *bourgeoisie*, now completely triumphant, were free to settle their relations with the working classes. *They reorganized labor as they pleased.*

And here comes in what is most vital in the social question in France. The abstract question of the rights of property has long ago been exhaustively discussed in France, both on the side of the Catholic Church and on that of the positivists, socialists, and theorists of every color. So have been the relations between capital and production, between the employer and the workingman. The Catholic Church is no theorist. She sets about binding up and healing the wounds of society, while others are speculating about their origin, their consequences, and their treatment.

In no country in the world—since the Revolution and anti-Christian Freemasonry have taken out of the hands of religion the people and institutions of Italy—has that same religion done more for the workingman and the indigent classes than in the land of France. Nowhere, at this moment, can the statesman and economist behold such admirably organized hosts of men and women, whose best efforts are devoted to the enlightenment of the laboring

classes; to their moral, intellectual, and physical elevation; and to bringing about between capital and labor, between masters and their workmen, that perfect harmony of interests which can only repose on practical brotherly love.

The three published volumes of Count Albert de Mun's discourses leave not one question regarding the wrongs and rights of workingmen untouched. There is not a single practical remedy ever devised by human wisdom, or supernatural charity, for the evils which embitter the hearts and darken the lives of the toilers of earth or its disinherited poor, that the noble director of the workingmen's circles has not most eloquently described and most efficiently applied.

Here in Paris thousands upon thousands of the children of toil, young and old, look up to him with a gratitude and a veneration which are only paid to men who have something God-like about them, and who are felt to be God's instruments for good.

To us it is a wonder how one man, of delicate health too, and with heavy and responsible duties to discharge in his place in Parliament, can find time and strength to multiply his presence all over France, wherever there is need of founding or developing one of these workingmen's circles, and to deliver there a discourse which you could wish to see printed in letters of gold, on tablets as durable as bronze, and hung up there forever.

Catholics in America, friends and helpers of the workingman everywhere, who only know and love Count de Mun for his most eloquent and most successful advocacy of the duties as well as the rights of capital and labor; for his enforcement of the Gospel law of equality, fraternity, and liberty, will be sorry to see any shade cast on so bright and pure a name in M. Drumont's pages.

But there are, besides, among the *bourgeois*, or wealthy middle classes in France, many and many a noble Christian man and woman who make it the pride, the duty, the pleasure of their life to help Count Albert de Mun in promoting all his great works of social charity. We need only mention the two Harmels, father and son, wealthy manufacturers, who are not only benefactors and fathers to their numerous workmen, but who are, without doubt, the apostles of that true Christian socialism which the Church practises, enforces, whenever or wherever she is able to do so.

Again, looking to the Catholic journalists and publicists of France, men who have rendered, during the present century, the most precious services to religion and society, we find that five-sixths of them belong to the middle-class. We have only to name such men as the illustrious brothers, Louis and Eugene Veuillot, together with the staff of men who, for more than fifty years, have been foremost in the front ranks of the battle against Antichrist.

Noblemen and *bourgeois* stand there side by side, forgetting all the differences of birth and social position, and mindful only of the one duty of doing a true yeoman's work in the cause of God and the poor.

The same is to be said of the French Catholic clergy. Its ranks are recruited from every class in society. If the majority are taken from the families of the peasantry and the laboring poor, the wealthy *bourgeoisie* contribute many glorious names to the minority, while, perhaps, the old nobility contribute a still larger contingent.

It is none the less but too true that the Voltairian middle classes are now more than ever, and have been ever since 1830, the controlling force in French politics, French public opinion, and French education. Since the accession of Napoleon III. the Masonic power has drawn into its nets the generations educated in the government schools. By slow but steady degrees the lodges have controlled the administration, the army and navy, the hosts of men and women under the command of the Minister of Public Instruction, and the still more numerous hosts of officials in every department of the public service.

It is, at this moment, notorious that no man or woman has the slightest chance of public employment or advancement, unless such as are affiliated to these openly and avowedly anti-Christian lodges.

It will throw no little light on what we have to say of the land and agricultural movement in the United States, to glance here at what monopolists are doing in France to ruin the latter and depreciate the former.

"The most odious monopoly of all," says M. Drumont,¹ "the monopoly which will end by letting loose on the Jews and their followers the public indignation, is that which is practised on all articles of prime necessity, on the industry and very existence of mankind. . . . The Rothschilds could not help being impelled to such monopolies as this, and thereby to aim at our absolute, shrewd, total subjugation.

This *Graineterie Française* (the 'commerce or monopoly of grain') . . . has covered the market-places of Paris with fres. . . . For the sad trials already heaped on our growers; the 'comaine' has flooded the market with foreign corn, and has thus taken away from our French farmers the small profit they might have derived from a season exceptionally favorable.

"This grain monopoly, exclusively controlled by German Jews, we are informed by *La Gazette des Campagnes*, seeing that, during the month of May (1886), there was, all through Europe, the

¹ *La Fin d'un Monde*, pp. 56-58.

prospect of a poor harvest, . . . made an arrangement with the Bank of Nevada, and purchased all the wheat stored up in Chicago, New York, St. Louis, and San Francisco. On June 15th they had thus purchased 37,000,000 of hectolitres of American wheat.

"Thus encouraged, the Jewish speculators bought up that same week all the grain to be found on the markets of Liverpool, London, Hamburg, and Berlin, to the amount of 3,500,000 of hectolitres.

"In less than a week the Jewish combine had raised the price of wheat up to \$10.50, \$11.75, and \$12.00 a sack.

"The trick was played, and the unfortunate purchasers who happened to be uncovered, were obliged to pass through the *Furcæ Caudinæ* of the band.

"Then came fine weather in June; the prices fell, and the 37,000,000 of hectolitres of American wheat were sold for \$2.00, \$2.25, and \$1.80 the hectolitre.

"This edifying narrative (says M. Louis Hervé, quoted by *Le Monde*) gives us some perception of the *Crédit Agricole* as carried on by the Semitic race both in the Old World and in the New. This explains to us the incredible and absurd fluctuations undergone by grain and flour during the last four months.

"Free traders must be very blind if they do not, by this time, know who is to be held accountable for the high price of bread, and that the wheat-grower is the first victim of these cosmopolitan stock-gamblers. . . . At this moment they are laying their Semitic claws on the coal-mining stocks of England, Belgium, France, and Germany, so as to control the sales and dictate their law to all buyers."

M. Drumont here accuses the French Minister of War of playing into the hands of the "Cosmopolitans," and of so ruining French agriculture that in case of a war with Germany, German Jews would alone have the provisioning of both armies. "The protestations of our farmers," he says, "the remonstrances of the Department Councils, petitions addressed to the Government—all is useless. The Minister of War, no matter who he is, knows well that on the very day he would cease to serve the Jewish interest he would be put out of office by the votes of the Freemasons, who are sold to Israel."

These are terrible accusations. But up to the present moment no one has attempted to refute them seriously. The only replies to the author's courageous denunciations of such wholesale treason come from persons who smart under the pitiless lash of the writer.

"What we have said," M. Drumont tells us, further on, "on the syndicate on wheat, is literally applicable to the syndicate on sugar. . . . The Jews began by disturbing the market by their wholesale purchases and their deals. The sugar manufacturers and re-

finers, unable to contend against this formidable combination, were either ruined out and out, or forced to play into the hands of the speculators. Those who thus sided with the Jews have had no reason to complain. For, in the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies of January 15, 1886, M. Sans-Leroy declared that the refiners of Paris received in a single year eight millions of dollars as their share of the fraudulent profits thus realized.

"While these parasites are thus growing rich, the true laborers—the producers—are reduced to extreme poverty. Many farmers have given up cultivating flax, growing wool, wheat, and the white poppy,¹ and concentrate all their industry on raising the beet-root. They have gained nothing by it.

"Never, since the world has existed, have men seen a band of cosmopolitan freebooters displaying such hardihood, upsetting with such light-heartedness all the conditions of existence among peoples; introducing so unblushingly into the peaceful habits of trade gambling, false reports, lying, and thereby brutally ruining thousands of men to enrich themselves. This is the phenomenon of the closing century."

The *bourgeois* class, therefore, who now govern France, have saddled the country with an ever-increasing load of debt out of which there seems to be, in the present paralysis of agriculture and the rapid decline of all manner of national industry, no issue but national bankruptcy; these are the men on whom M. Drumont vents his patriotic wrath. Just as we are writing this, the law-suits instituted, with the authorization of Parliament, against the two Deputies, Daniel Wilson and Numa Gilly, promise to unveil such an extent of official corruption as fully justifies M. Drumont's vehement and frequent denunciations.

Too true is it, then, that the *bourgeoisie* to-day in power are the descendants and the heirs of the men who made the Revolution of 1789, who alone profited by its wholesale confiscations, and who, in 1889, are determined to wrest from their Catholic or monarchical adversaries every remnant of their vested rights, every shred of religious and political liberty.

This is the situation which the civilized world should consider attentively. It has its lessons for the freemen of America, as well as for the subjects of every power in Europe.

The Paris Municipal Council, the great majority of which is made up of men of the class we have been describing, is openly devoted to the realization of the most advanced forms of anti-Christian socialism. Nothing but the merest accident can prevent this powerful body of determined men from proclaiming, at any

¹ The salad oil produced by the white poppy (*œillet*) rivals, among the poor at least, the fruit of the olive.

moment, the supremacy of the Commune. And this example is sure to be followed by Lyons and Marseilles, and other French cities. The present Floquet-Lockroy Ministry are pledged to a revision of the Constitution in an extreme radical sense, to the abolition of the Senate and the Presidency, to the repeal of the Concordat, the suppression of the salaries paid to the clergy, to the sequestration of all Church property, as well as of that belonging to all religious or quasi-religious associations, or even individuals.

On the ruins of the Church and State, of the old Christian order, thus swept out of existence, the men in power will build up, or attempt to build up, a community governed by the principles of advanced socialism, collectivism, and anarchism combined. They will, perhaps, call it a Social-Democratic Republic; but God only knows what it will be.

M. Drumont, who, it seems, is not unwelcome among the anarchistic leaders, thus describes their near expectations: "Once," said they, "that we are put in possession, ourselves, our wives and children, of the palatial residences and beautiful houses of the aristocratic quarters (of Paris), and when we shall have burned down the registry offices, those of the lawyers and notaries, the seat of every public administration—those who should attempt to turn us out must be clever indeed!"

"It is through kindness to me," adds M. Drumont, "that several of these men have assured me that they entertained no special ill-will toward the churches; that they only intended to burn all baptismal registers that could help people to establish their civil standing."¹

The supremacy of the hitherto oppressed and suffering working classes, without any faith in God or belief in the life to come; without any religion but the worship of their own notions of right, and no law but the gratification of their desires, such is the IDEAL government these madmen contemplate.

Is it, then, wonderful that, in presence of such imminent and fearful changes, all Frenchmen who love the true greatness of their country, who cling to the religion of their forefathers, and would preserve the popular masses from the anti-Christian deluge now sweeping over Europe, should combine and exert themselves heroically to bring the laboring classes and the poor into the Ark of Christian principle, peace and practice?

We should be, therefore, much more anxious to see the Workmen's Circles founded by Count de Mun and M. Chesnelong, and patronized by such true "Knights of Labor" as the MM. Harmel, Abbé Garnier and Cardinal Langénieux, flourishing and mul-

¹ *La Fin d'un Monde*, p. 28.

tipling their numbers over France, than concerned about the plans proposed for recovering from the International Bank and the Rothschilds the thousands of millions accumulated by criminal and fraudulent speculation.

Until Frenchmen themselves cease to tolerate, to encourage, to participate in these godless schemes for acquiring sudden and enormous wealth at the expense of the public, to the detriment of all lawful industry and of the national honor and credit—it were, apparently, idle to declaim against the foreigners who build up gigantic fortunes on the foibles and follies of the native-born citizen.

We in America are all too familiar with the methods of such greedy and unprincipled speculators. Until the laws of our country, supported by a sound public opinion, shall have stepped in to restrain stock-gambling and to punish the gamblers, we shall continue to have our “Black Friday.” We have also our trusts, our pools, our combines, our monopolies—as they have them in France and the adjacent countries.

All these are the curse of legitimate and honest labor, just as they are the excesses and abuses of the money-power in every State. Nevertheless, in the interest of labor itself, it were better not to call in the interference of the State, unless compelled to do so by the direst extremity.

But in France, as well as in Belgium, the only remedy found for the oppression and suffering produced by the omnipotence of capital, and the greed of great corporations, is to adapt to modern circumstances the systems counseled by religion in the mediæval cities, and which made starvation, pauperism, and a helpless old age things unknown among their guildsmen or trades-unions.

To come to specific and practical measures for benefiting the laboring classes, those, in particular, who are employed in large manufacturing or mining centres, we must be allowed to quote here from *La Réforme Sociale* of October 16th last, passages from a paper read at Lille, in the month of April, before a general assembly of the Catholic Unions of Flanders, Artois, and Picardie. The paper was written and read by M. Guary, Director-General of the Coal Mines of Anzin, who presided in the Assembly at Lille, and is a type of the true Catholic *bourgeoisie*, devoted heart and soul to the work of elevating the thousands of miners and workers under him.

The object of the paper is to show how the “Patronage” of the great Coal-Mining Company of Anzin, established in 1757, is exercised for the protection of all its employees and their families, so as to secure them cheap clothing, provisions, medical assistance, comfortable and healthy lodgings, religious education for the

children, religious instruction for all, and certain provision against infirmity and old age.

In 1865 the company established co-operative stores, under the name of "Co-operative Society of the Coal-Miners of Anzin." They began with a capital of \$5000 divided into \$10 shares. This was employed in purchasing cloths and stuffs, hosiery, etc., together with flour, bread, groceries, lard and bacon. At first butcher's meat was bought and sold out to the men. But they gave it up in summer. All the articles bought are of good quality, and are sold at the current prices in the district, the profits all going to the miners themselves, who are the only shareholders.

The capital invested steadily increased, till it reached \$50,000 in 1888, the number of shareholders being 3,022, about one-half of the employees of the company. Many of the miners live too far away from the stores or shops, of which there are fourteen, to be able to avail themselves of their advantages.

The company at first only gave the ground for the first store, then it gave gratuitously the ground and all the building materials. Now that the society is a great success, it limits itself to carrying free all the merchandise and provisions needed by the stores.

The directors aimed not only to teach the workingmen the rules and practice of domestic economy, but the manner as well of managing the entire business of the co-operative stores themselves. So among the nine members of the Board of Managers, five are workingmen; the others are an ex-agent of the company, an engineer, the superintendent, physician, and a druggist. All these are selected by the shareholders.

The first effect produced by the working of the society was to prevent the miners from getting into debt, and to help them to get out of it. The shareholders are given a fortnight's credit for their purchases. These must be paid for at the end of the second week. No advance is given on unearned salaries. If the last fortnight's accounts are not paid up, no articles are given to the debtor, except for cash paid down, unless he should have sickness or some misfortune in his family, which in the judgment of the board should justify an extension of credit.

The lodging-houses provided for the miners are spacious, healthy, comfortable, well kept, and erected with a view to securing family privacy. Each family pays about \$1 per month for house-rent. Each cottage has also a nice garden-plot.

In the beginning the company generously encouraged their workmen to become the owners of their own cottages; and for this purpose they gave the buildings just for what they had cost, accepting instalments of about \$3 a month in payment of the debt and no interest being asked on the capital expended in the erec-

tion. But, as the French law does not allow parents to leave their property to the oldest or the best-behaved child, these cottages, on the death of the first owners, were sold by the Government at public auction to the highest bidder. And in more than one instance the house thus sold was turned into a tavern. 'Twas a pity; but the company found it wiser to help the cottagers to live comfortably and to lay by their savings for old age.

Since 1833 means have been taken by the company, with the co-operation of the miners, to establish a savings bank for sickness and old age; for widows and orphans. Thereby these thousands of laborers can look forward without anxiety to the time when they can no longer work.

As religion, since the first establishment of this company, has been one of its directing forces, one may expect to see the education of the children and young people also well provided for. They have religious masters for the boys; and the girls' schools are under the charge of Sisters, who also minister to the sick and bring them the prescribed medicines, etc.

To the girls' schools are attached workshops, where the pupils are taught household work, sewing, mending, washing, bleaching, and tailoring. As there is a school for master-miners, the boys, after their first elementary instruction, are sent to this when they give good promise of talent and proficiency.

Every mining village has its church, where the people regularly attend the Sunday services, and are instructed in the Christian doctrine and the duties of Christian life. The children, on making their first communion, receive each a gratuity of 12 francs; and the boys get a complete outfit the first time they are sent down in the mines.

The expenses of public worship, the services of the priest, and those of the physician, are all paid by the company.

M. Guary, from whose paper these details have been taken, has some passages toward the end which should be textually quoted. He is a disciple of Frederic Le Play, and thus speaks of what happened at the meeting of the Society of Social Economy in 1887:

"In his eloquent address at the opening of our annual assembly of 1887, M. George Picot described what he had witnessed at Lille. Let those whose modesty I may alarm by quoting his words—for souls above the common modestly conceal their good deeds—forgive my repeating what he says, since they illustrate the truth I would inculcate. I should have known nothing, says the eminent Academician, 'if I had only followed the material details of the care and solicitude of the president of the company. I learned that not one workman was ever laid up who was not visited in his sickness by the family of some one of his em-

players; that not a child fell sick, or a death occurred without having some member of their families to see to the little sufferer, or to comfort the dying in the hour of supreme need. Thus was peace made between master and workman; thus was it maintained. . . .'

"Why," continues M. Guary, "does the magnanimous conduct so touchingly described by M. Picot find so few imitators among us? Why are the poor and the rich so seldom brought together by an intercourse which is the incomparable remedy for curing the wounds of both the one and the other? . . . By such intercourse we could teach the sufferer that the Christian religion, from which people try to turn his heart away, is his sole and best comfort and consolation, as well as the honor and glory of the lowly and the weak.

"We need intermediaries between the workingman and those above him. Since we are all here a single family, the family of Frederic Le Play, allow me to speak out what is in my mind. While glancing over the list of our 'Social Unions,' it seems to me that we have in them an army of officers; but there are neither non-commissioned officers nor soldiers, without whom there is no chance of winning a battle. We must by all means recruit this class of men;¹ and they are to be found among educated young men who have a career before them and a reputation to make. Then they should help to direct and protect the future of artisans and head-workmen, of all that numerous class who, to use the words of M. Picot, 'have many spare hours to dispose of, many idle days on their hands; and who, if they could only be banded together, would soon cast off their drooping spirits, and become joyous and energetic in the new hopes which would give them restored life and strength.'

"How shall we realize our purpose? This is a question to which the leaders of our school of social peace must, in their devotion, find an answer."

Deep as is the need of that social peace in France, we in America begin to feel that the mighty struggle between capital and labor should, among ourselves, be brought to a speedy and peaceful issue.

The past year was stormy and threatening enough in the world of industry. The Church, the Divine Teacher and Peacemaker,

¹ These Social Unions, as mentioned in a preceding article, are made up of two distinct but kindred societies, the "Society of Social Economy" and the "Unions of Social Peace," both combining their efforts to carry out the darling object of the illustrious Frederic Le Play—the reform of society in France. The members of both groups are the most distinguished magistrates, jurists, publicists, and economists in Europe; they should, as suggested by M. Guary, call to their assistance all the Catholic educated youth of their country.

has done not a little to still the tempest. It is timely, it is wise, to listen to the men who have again and again crossed this stormy zone, and noted its phenomena. Such a one is M. Claudio Jannet.

II.

In order to prepare the fourth edition of his now classical work, *Les États Unis Contemporains*, M. Jannet visited our country as well as Canada, observing, noting everything worthy of observation; conversing with the most eminent public men; examining our public establishments of every kind; questioning men of opposite parties and opinions; in one word, taking every means to arrive at a just and enlightened opinion regarding our political and economical condition.

With the former issues of his book the most competent publicists in America, Protestant as well as Catholic, have expressed their great satisfaction. Doubtless, ere this article appears in print, the American press will have pronounced their judgment on the two volumes now before us, and which contain the mature and perfect fruit of the author's conscientious researches.

His conclusions are summed up in a remarkable address delivered on the 29th of last May, before a general meeting of the *Union de la Paix Sociale*, and which we had the pleasure of hearing. The discourse, published in *La Réforme Sociale* of October 16th and November 1st, bears for title "The Social Constitution of the United States in 1888."

Speaking of the land and labor questions as influenced by the rapid increase of our population and the incoming yearly tide of emigrants from foreign parts, M. Jannet says :

"A very important fact is here to be noted, namely, that in our days there has arisen quite a hostile movement against further immigration, an evident desire of stopping this increasing influx of strangers. First, the Chinese were excluded, and this was justified by good reasons. It was important that a population of an entirely different race should not grow in the Pacific States and the West, just as the Negro race had grown up in the Southern States. At this moment, the opposition goes further : it is sought to exclude all poor immigrants, even those of European race. And we may reckon upon it as certain that, ere many years have passed, the United States will employ restrictive measures to prevent a too great increase in immigration from Europe.

"More than one law has already been enacted to hinder European capitalists from getting hold of lands. The citizens of the United States are determined, henceforth, to keep for themselves their patrimonial domain, immense as it is.

"Do the United States, then, feel that their population is

becoming too dense? No. Is the natural wealth of their territory exhausted? Certainly not yet. But notwithstanding the fact that this territorial wealth is still unexhausted, and that there is a wide and fruitful field for the investment of capital, it is none the less undeniable that the country no longer teems with the abundance of nature's gifts as it did some years ago. The vast territorial expanse between the Alleghanies and the Missouri is nearly all filled up. Instead of getting land there for nothing, as in former days, the would-be settler has to pay for it a comparatively high price. Lands to be had without payment are only to be had a great way off, further west, in the country between the Missouri and the Rocky Mountains. There the climate is dry and less propitious; woods are scarce, and in some regions artificial irrigation has to be resorted to.

"What conclusions shall we draw from all this? That to own land does not make a man rich; he must also have capital to enable him to cultivate it. Hence the culture of land in the Far West demands, as a necessary condition, the investment of capital to give value to the husbandman's possessions."

M. Jannet goes on to remark that, to a very large extent, the owners of land let it out to farmers. This system, he says, is doing great service to the country. Very many persons thus work for others in order to earn money enough to enable them to purchase afterwards farms of their own. "To attempt to settle on land, without any capital whatever, is for any man ruin, destruction."

In other territories of the Republic, especially where long droughts prevail, the only remunerative industry is cattle-raising. Immense extents of land are devoted to the rearing of oxen and horses. On these border-lands there is a continual rivalry, and not unfrequently bloody frays, between the capitalists and the settlers who plant their homesteads along the water-courses, and who represent the small farmer class devoted to raising cereals.

Great changes have occurred of late years in the agricultural condition of the Eastern and Middle States. The international commerce which has produced such an acute crisis in the value of land and all farming produce in Europe, has had its parallel in the American Republic. The wheat from India and the rich cereal crops grown in Manitoba have depressed the value of the same articles both in the Far West and in California.

In the Eastern and Middle States no more cereals are raised. Pasturage, dairy work, the growing of vegetables, the rearing of fowls, etc., have, according to M. Jannet, replaced the old agricultural occupations of New England, whose farmers and house-wives now aim to supply the daily markets of their numerous and populous cities.

So much for the land and its industries.

Now, as to the great manufacturing industries and the labor question. M. Jannet begins by asserting a fact which may be new to most of the readers of the REVIEW. It has been ascertained that the density of the population between Boston and Baltimore is nearly equal, square mile by square mile, to that of France, Belgium, and Germany. This is the region which is thickly studded with great cities. There are situated the rich deposits of coal and petroleum. It is also the seat of the great manufacturing industries. The economical conditions of this part of the United States are not unlike those of Western Europe.

Such is M. Jannet's estimate.

"Nevertheless," he says, "this same great district has a great advantage, as compared with us. And that is, that whosoever is active, laborious, persevering, and, above all, temperate in his habits (this is a vital condition in America)—every man who is temperate and saving can more easily raise himself up to competence and wealth than such a man could in our old Europe.

"A gentleman of wide experience in Worcester, a large industrial city of Massachusetts, proved some short time ago that of 100 leading manufacturers of that city, ninety began by being simple day-laborers. This tells us that in such a country there is room for all to make their way upward, and that many succeed in doing so."

This is the bright and hopeful side.

But the dark side has not escaped M. Jannet's observation. Women and even children have, as in France and Belgium, to work in our factories in order to enable the family to live. And although the workman's wages is nominally higher with us, the cost of living is, comparatively, so much greater that our laborers are worse off than in Europe. Then with us strikes are more frequent, and these are a serious drain on the workingman's resources.

While we are still following the sagacious French observer along the soil of New England into the Middle States, we must note one very natural omission in his work—the ruin of our ship-building industry, and the deterioration of our magnificent seafaring population into factory hands, wasting their lives away in the great shoemaking workshops of Lynn and Boston, or in the cotton and woollen factories along the coast and in the interior.

Before our great Civil War, and the deep disturbances it caused both in our social and in our economical conditions, we do not think there was in the world anything superior to the men who commanded and manned our fleets of clippers and steamships. Apart from the irreparable ruin caused to our native ship-builders, and to our carrying-trade on the ocean, there is the loss of our generations of hardy and intelligent sailors, who could have always

secured us the supremacy on sea along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

What statesman will take this matter up and revive our shipping industries, and with them call back into life the glorious American seamanship of fifty years ago?

If the politicians of the Atlantic States are too selfish and shortsighted to heed the warnings of quite recent events, why does not California set the patriotic example? She should be mistress of the Pacific.

M. Jannet next touches on what constitutes the great social peril of the United States, the birth and growth of that gigantic money power which not only threatens to oppress all individual and local initiative in industry and commerce, but to enslave hopelessly our laboring populations.

"In America," he says, "the heads of great industries, powerful companies like the Standard Oil Company, which monopolizes the sale of petroleum, the proprietors of the Pennsylvania coal mines, will of a sudden stop or limit their output, without any thought of the hundreds of workmen thrown out of employment.

"I am here pointing out," he continues, "what is the sorest spot in the social constitution of the United States. There have sprung up there great financial societies, which make up a power against which it is hopeless to struggle. Unhappily these societies have not always a conscientious regard to their duties, and treat their workmen with heartless cruelty." The author quotes, in support of his assertion, the report of the Pennsylvania Secretary of State in 1885: all but two millions of dollars stolen yearly from the workmen by a well organized system of fraudulent weights and measures; the salaries paid only once a month, and cut down from ten to twenty per cent. in punishment of pretended infractions of the rules. Then the system of paying the balance of the miners' wages in orders on the company's clothing and provision stores—all the tyrannical wrongs which coöperative stores of the miners of Anzin so effectually remedied.

But the readers of the *REVIEW*, after all the harrowing scenes of last year's experience in the coal regions of Pennsylvania, need only to be reminded of the abuses arising from this irresponsible money power to appreciate the successful efforts made in France and Belgium to attack the evil in its very root.

Coming to the efforts made to withstand the oppression exercised actually, and the still greater oppression threatened in the future, by these "combines," "trusts," monopolies, etc., M. Jannet proceeds:

"The doctrine which seems to prevail in the socialistic organizations of the United States is the collectivism of Karl Marx. What it proposes is to make war on capital, war on industrial and commercial capital, with the aim of one day handing over all this

capital to the State and to the workingmen's corporations under the control of the State.

"These notions were extensively circulated among the Knights of Labor, although their present master-workman professed opinions diametrically opposed to them. The majority of the local branches of the order were, two years ago, more or less under the influence of Karl Marx's teaching, if one may judge from their official organs in the public press."

M. Jannet then gives a brief sketch of the order up to the present year. "Mr. Powderly," he says, "always repudiated, in his own name, the collectivist doctrines. He would settle all labor troubles by arbitration, or by a friendly understanding between employers and workmen. But strikes were always the last resource (*ultima ratio*) with the Knights of Labor, especially where they were the masters. Besides, the entrance into the order of numerous associations already formed, together with their staffs of politicians and leaders, did not conduce to unity and strength. These bodies had no idea of being entirely assimilated; they persisted in pursuing their own separate purposes. So that the general direction given by Mr. Powderly was not followed in practice by the mass of his adherents. The socialistic elements, underhand, did their own work and spread their own ideas."

The condemnation of the Canadian Knights is then mentioned. A branch of the order, with all its Masonic signs, etc., had been founded in Montreal by a Jew of the name of Heilbronner, and had caused no little trouble between employers and workmen in a country where the social peace had never before been disturbed. The Canadian bishops, together with the Cardinal-Archbishop of Quebec, condemned the order.

"In the United States, however," says M. Jannet, "the American bishops had equally good reasons for not condemning the Knights of Labor. For, in the Republic the workingmen, having no direct bond connecting them with their employers, no permanent relation founded on custom, stand in need of an organization to protect themselves against the exactions and extortions committed against them by the great industrial companies. And, as the direction given by Mr. Powderly to the order at the time [the condemnation was pronounced in Canada] was a just and proper one, it is easy to understand why the American bishops remonstrated with the Holy Father, and prevented his giving formal condemnation."

"After all, when we examine the official programmes issued by the Knights of Labor, and consider only the general direction given to the order by its present master-workman, we can discover, at most, a few economical errors. Now, Rome has never yet excommunicated anybody for economical errors; and this is fortunate. Mr. Powderly wants the State to work the railroads and telegraph

lines itself; wants it to issue bank-notes to an unlimited amount; and would have the State interfere in many ways in controlling labor.

"These are mere scientific errors—nothing more. And hence the prohibition uttered by the Canadian bishops against the Knights of Labor was suspended in consequence of a memoir presented to the Propaganda by Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore."

The decision of the Propaganda, as well as the more recent decision of the Holy Father, with respect to the Knights, is not, as M. Jannet remarks, to be considered in any wise as an *approbation*. "The majority of the American hierarchy," he adds, "who took part in this proceeding, were careful to declare that the Holy See had not approved the order. Every Bishop, in his own diocese, gave the Knights a severe warning, recommending most especially that they should not violate the freedom of other laborers who do not belong to their association, if they did not wish to court, later on, a sentence of condemnation."

"But," concludes M. Jannet, "there never will be any occasion for condemning them, since this gigantic soap-bubble has already burst."

The conclusion, we are happy to say, was a hasty one. The order, though apparently much weakened by defection and divisions, is powerful still. They have once more held their general convention, and again placed Mr. Powderly at their head as General Master-Workman. This, with the latest instruction of Leo XIII. regarding them, will be an inducement to be more careful in selecting and admitting their members; more careful still in avoiding everything that savors of socialism, even of the State socialism advocated by Mr. Powderly.

With men like Cardinal Gibbons and his associates in the Episcopacy to counsel and warn their leaders, the Knights may long fill an important place in our social economy, and stand as a bulwark against the encroachments of combined capital on the rights of the workingman.

We need such organizations, when well-principled and wisely directed, in our great and free country. But what we need more—and what must be the joint creation of the clergy, the capitalists, and the workingmen themselves—are such societies, founded on Christian charity, as those existing in France and Belgium, and which we have only glanced at in the preceding pages.

There is among American employers too much of inborn generosity, love of justice, and appreciation of the rights of manhood, not to make us hope for prompt coöperation from them when rightly appealed to.

We want combined action in doing the work of God and the brotherhood. The time needs it, and the country is ripe for it.

SAVONAROLA.

JEROME SAVONAROLA was born at Ferrara in 1452. Naturally of a grave disposition, he soon manifested an enthusiastic piety, and at the age of twenty-three he donned the habit of a Friar-Preacher at Bologna. His strict observance of the rule, his great talents, and, not least of all, his remarkably striking presence, drew upon him the admiration of the multitude; so that his superior determined to utilize his influence in the pulpit. His first attempt at preaching, however, was not a success. It was made in 1482, in the church of St. Lawrence, in Florence; and when he had finished, says Burlamachi, one of his most zealous admirers, he found that only twenty persons had remained.¹ Both he and his audience having decided that he was no orator, he for a time occupied a chair of philosophy, but soon abandoned the study of Aristotle and St. Thomas for that of Scripture. Now he was content, for his contemplative nature fully appreciated the lofty ideas and the mysterious and figurative style of the divine books. For several years he had devoted himself, night and day, to his Biblical studies, when he was again unexpectedly brought before the public. It was the celebrated Pico della Mirandola who was the means of pushing the retiring student into publicity, and of causing him to enter upon a career which was to prove his destruction. This great scholar, one of the brightest luminaries of his own or any other age, had heard Savonarola lecture at Reggio, and had been so impressed by his eloquence that he prevailed upon Lorenzo de Medici to call the friar to Florence. In 1489 Savonarola was appointed professor of Scripture to the young religious of the convent of St. Mark, and as his oratorical powers had greatly developed since his failure at St. Lawrence's, he soon acquired a great reputation. Before long, impelled by the enthusiasm he excited, he reappeared in the pulpit; and voluptuous Florence was astonished at his denunciations of her vices and at the threats of chastisement which, by command of God, he said, he poured forth. The sermons of Savonarola, as we have them, are not from his own hand; they were taken down, as delivered, by some of his auditors.² But imperfect as they are, we can readily imagine the effect they must have produced. "His eloquence was not that which comes from the use of the orator's arts, or from a

¹ *Life of F. Jerome Savonarola*, Lucca, 1761, p. 23.

² Tiraboschi: b. iii., c. 6.

depth of reasoning, or from an emotion agitating the orator's self. It was an eloquence which seemed to despise all human aids, and which, like the mystical figures of Fra Angelico, looks toward heaven and does not touch the earth. . . . Savonarola is like no other orator. True or pretended, he is a prophet; he has the visions, the incoherence, the seizures, the figurative language, the rashness of one. For this reason, rather than by means of his talent, great as it was, he captivated the multitude."¹ Several years before the Italian expedition of Charles VIII., Savonarola had predicted to his auditors that a foreign prince, led by the Lord, would become master of Italy without drawing his sword; and when, in 1494, he heard of the preparations being made in France, he quoted the passage of Genesis which threatens the deluge, and cried out: "Oh! ye just, enter into the ark. Behold, the cataracts of heaven are opened; I see the plains inundated, and the mountains disappearing in the midst of the waters. Behold the day of the Lord's vengeance!" His predictions were universally believed, and his authority over the multitude became so great that a contemporary historian says that posterity will find it just as difficult to believe as he finds it hard, having witnessed these events, to describe them.² A change came over gay and voluptuous Florence. Vice of every kind disappeared, and piety became so general that Buriamachi tells us that the days of the primitive Church seemed to have returned.³ Nor was the eloquence of the friar restricted to a combat with vice alone. The Renaissance in letters and art had been more favorable to science than to faith, and for about a century an almost idolatrous worship had been extended to the works of Pagan antiquity, to the detriment of Scriptural and Patristic lore. Paganism had so far corrupted the minds of men that even the members of the Roman Academy of Pomponius Laetus were accused of thinking that the Christian faith rested on light foundations.⁴ Art, as well as literature and true science, had suffered from this revival of Pagan sentiment.⁵ The painter and the sculptor, influenced by the works exhibited in the Medici gardens,

¹ Christophe: *History of the Papacy in the 15th Century*, v. ii., b. 16. Lyons, 1863.

² Nardi: *History of the City of Florence*, b. ii.

³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 86.

⁴ Canensius: *Life of Paul II.*, p. 78. Tiraboschi: v. vi., p. ii., b. 2.

⁵ "Pagan ideas again flourish; the books, statues, and buildings of Paganism are restored; modern works are modeled after the ancient, to the sacrifice of originality and of naturalness; the authority of a philosopher or of a poet is weighed against that of the Scriptures or of a Father—professors even say, 'Christ teaches thus, Aristotle and Plato thus;' the Platonic sublimity disappears in theosophical delirium; only Pagan virtues are praised, and the names of Greeks and Romans are substituted for those received at baptism. . . . Lorenzo de Medici sings sacred hymns to please his mother, and makes obscene jokes to gratify his boon companions." Cantù: *Heretics of Italy*, Discourse XI.

had adopted naturalism as a system, and, banishing the ideal, produced merely the expression of human beauty—decency and modesty were ignored, and Savonarola indignantly asked the artists why they put their mistresses upon the altars, and why they pictured the Blessed Virgin like a courtesan.¹ All this was changed by the Dominican reformer. On two different occasions the Florentines made immense bonfires, and performed a real and meritorious *auto-da-fe*, by throwing into the flames their books on impure love, their lascivious pictures and statues, while joyous strains of music floated over the great square of the cathedral.

From the very commencement of his preaching Savonarola had proclaimed the necessity of purifying the sanctuary; but at first, in this matter, he restrained his usual impetuosity, and confined himself to declamations against the laxity, then but too prevalent, of ecclesiastical discipline. But his growing popularity soon affected his judgment and banished his reserve. From the accession of Alexander VI. to the Papacy, he bitterly inveighed against that Pontiff, and consequently his auditors were divided into two factions. His partisans were known as *frateschi*, or "friarites," and sometimes as *piangoni*, or "weepers," while those who, either in good or bad faith, trembled lest his denunciation would injure both Church and state, were called by his followers *tepidi*, or "lukewarm," and *arrabiati*, or "madmen."² To neutralize the influence of the Dominican, the *arrabiati* made use of the Augustinian, Mariano da Gennazzano, a friend of the Medici, and a man esteemed as much for his austere morals as for his talents,³ and of whom Savonarola himself said that "if he had the eloquence of Mariano, he would be the first of orators."⁴ But the impassioned genius of the agitator still held the people entranced. A Franciscan named Dominic de Ponzio was then put forward to stem the torrent, but the Grand Council, a legislative body instituted after Savonarola had procured the expulsion of Piero de Medici, prohibited his preaching. The Dominican had now become the real ruler of Florence, and the devotion of the citizens to their liberator took the form of insanity. Nerli tells us that they often interrupted their prayers to rush from the churches, and to the cry of "*Viva Cristo*," they would dance in circles, formed of friars and laymen, placed alternately.⁵ But the *arrabiati* did not lose courage, and the war of factions became so general that the very children took

¹ *Sermon for the Saturday before 2d Sunday of Lent.*

² Nerli: *Commentaries on the Civil Affairs of Florence*, p. 68.

³ Poliziano and Pontano greatly laud him as a preacher.

⁴ Tiraboschi: v. 6, b. 3.

⁵ *Lœc. cit.*, b. iv., p. 75.

part in it, and showed their zeal by pelting each other with stones.¹ The opponents of Savonarola, most of them partisans of the exiled Piero de Medici, now took the more efficacious means of discrediting their enemy by denouncing him to the Pope. Some of his most bitter sermons were sent to Rome, and the Augustinian, Mariano, who had been exiled from Florentine territory, preached before the Pontiff and the Sacred College a most fiery sermon, in which he cried out: "Burn, Holy Father, burn this instrument of the devil; burn, I tell you, this scandal of the whole Church."² At first, Pope Alexander contented himself with charging Cardinal Caraffa, the protector of the Dominican order, to check the indiscretions of the friar; but since the cardinal, himself a reformer, took no active measures, we must suppose that the Pontiff decided to let the matter rest.

At this time the worst accusation against Savonarola was that of being more of a tribune, yea, of a demagogue, than of an ecclesiastic and a friar. The charge of heresy, made by the *arrabiati*, was unfounded; in the heat of improvisation he may have been, and doubtless was, inexact in his expressions, but he had deliberately attacked no Catholic teaching. As for his political notions, he was a thorough republican, and carried his principles to their utmost logical conclusions; he was a firm advocate of universal suffrage. All, said he, are interested in the State; all, therefore, should have a voice in the government.³ Hence his institution of the *Consiglio Grande* of a thousand members, elected by the votes of all the citizens, and that of the *Consiglio degli Scelti* (Council of the Select), formed of eighty persons of over forty years of age, chosen by the former. Savonarola no longer inhabited the cell of a friar; that modest apartment had been turned into a hall of audience and of political wrangling. Florence soon found that she had exchanged the despotism of the Medici for that of the friar, for despite his liberal institutions, the reformer allowed no political measure to be taken without his permission. Marino Sanuto, a Venetian chronicler, tells us that "a stone could not be moved without his consent. . . . He was lord and governor of Florence."⁴ It is worthy of note that Machiavelli, though not a partisan of Savonarola, says, in his *Discourses*, that so great a man must be treated with respect, and he tells Leo X. that the Florentine state can be firmly re-established only by the restoration of the friar's *Consiglio Grande*. Guicciardini, whose *History* was written with a different animus from that pervading his unedited works, allows, in these

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

² Burlamachi: p. 34. Nardi: b. ii., p. 35.

³ Nardi: b. i., p. 18.

⁴ *Chronicles of Venice*.—Burchard: *Diary*.

latter, his conscience to speak; and in his book on the *Government of Florence* he admits: "We owe much to this friar, who, without shedding a drop of blood, knew how to accomplish what otherwise would have cost much blood and disorder. Before him Florence had been governed by a restricted circle of *ottimati*, and then she had fallen into all the excesses of popular rule, which would have produced anarchy. He alone, from the beginning, knew how to be liberal without loosening the reins." But the reader will be pleased to hear the reformer himself on this subject. In the *Abridgment of his Revelations*, published by Bzovius, he says to the Florentines: "After examining with care the state of your city, and the coming revolutions in its form of government which would seem inevitable, I have persuaded myself that the great change will not be effected without danger or without even the effusion of blood, unless Divine Providence comes to your aid out of consideration for the justice and piety of the citizens who are worthy. In this spirit, and relying on this hope, I earnestly besought the people to be reconciled to the Lord, and to merit His mercy by renewed fervor and sincere repentance. I commenced my discourses on this point, on St. Matthew's Day, Sept. 25, 1494. From that time the citizens appeared so zealous in the good works I had prescribed, that it pleased God to give tangible proof of His reconciliation with us; in fact, in the month of November, by a miracle of heaven's protection, you witnessed the desired change, and without bloodshed or other scandal. Now, since there was a question of proposing to you a new form of government, I assembled all the magistrates and notables of the city in the cathedral of Florence, excluding only those whose sex or condition prohibited their being called. . . . Having discoursed for some time on what had been written by philosophers, statesmen, and the most able theologians touching the best way of governing a state, I explained my opinion as to the form most suitable to the genius and profit of the Florentines. In the following discourses I proposed four articles, the necessity of which was admitted: I. Religion should be the basis and the first rampart of our government. II. All private interests should yield to the public good. III. By forgetting all past injuries and quarrels there would ensue a general and sincere peace, and in no way should any trouble accrue to those who hitherto administered the affairs of the state. And I added that there should always remain liberty of appeal from the tribunal of the six judges, so that no private person could ever usurp the sovereign authority. It was also my idea to establish a Great Council, composed of the wisest and most illustrious citizens, after the model of the Council of Venice; and that thereafter all offices, etc., should be conferred in the name of the people of Florence, and

not in the name of any single person, who might thus take occasion to aspire to tyranny. I made no difficulty of assuring the assembly that all I had proposed was conformable to God's law and to His will. . . . It was not only because of my peculiar knowledge of the Divine Will, but because of many conclusions of my reason, that I undertook to convince you of the advantages of this new form of government, the best fitted for your needs, the most favorable to liberty, and also the most apt to give great glory to your republic, which will thereby become more flourishing, both in the spiritual and in the temporal order."

Great numbers, incited, of course, by the partisans of the exiled Medici, soon revolted against the dictatorship imposed upon the city, and allied themselves with those who opposed the friar on religious grounds. In 1494 the superiors of the Dominicans deemed it prudent to forbid Savonarola to preach the Lenten course, although a Brief of Pope Alexander permitted him to give it. His followers then appealed to the Pontiff, and then Alexander, who is said to have been Savonarola's foe from the beginning, quashed the prohibition. In fact, during the early troubles of the Dominican, Alexander VI. paid but little attention to him; when he thought of him at all, it was rather with admiration. He had even conceived the idea, says Burlamachi, of enrolling the friar in the Sacred College. But now Alexander, although not prohibiting Savonarola from preaching, summoned him to Rome to explain his conduct. The reply was an allegation of infirmity and the need that Florence had of his presence. Then the Pontiff threatened the friar with the censures of the Church, and menaced the city of Florence with an interdict. The Florentine merchants, fearing the results of this measure, and many of the cardinals, who were rather favorable to the agitator, prevailed upon Alexander to withdraw his citation. However, the Pontiff gave an eloquent rebuke to his stubborn son, by leaving it to his own conscience whether or not he would continue to preach. This moderation seems to have somewhat affected Savonarola, for he withdrew from the pulpit, substituting, however, the friar Dominic of Pescia, also a Dominican, and a man of reputed holiness, who was far less fiery than himself.

The enemies of the friar regarded this retreat from the pulpit as a triumph for themselves; but when, in October, 1495, he broke his silence, they suffered from one of his most virulent tirades. Heaven, he said, would take condign vengeance upon those who had presumed to interfere with its work, namely, the establishment of popular government. To this denunciation he added new declamations on the need of reform in the Church. Pope Alexander now ordered the vicar-general of the Dominicans at Bologna to

examine into the charges against his subject, and to punish him, according to the rules of the Order, if he were found guilty. During the trial the friar was not to preach; but, in spite of this prohibition, Savonarola continued in the pulpit. The Pontiff now demanded that the republic should place the agitator in his hands, and as his request was not heeded, he launched an excommunication against him.¹ This sentence was read in six churches of Florence on June 18th, 1497. At first Savonarola seemed inclined to submit. He withdrew to his cell, admitted no visitors, and wrote a humble letter to the Pope. Alexander's answer was truly paternal. Among other encouraging remarks, he says: "In spite of facts, we begin to believe that you have not spoken in malice, but rather in simplicity, and out of zeal for the vineyard of the Lord." He concluded with a promise that if the friar would abstain from preaching, and come to Rome, he would annul the censures pronounced. To this letter Savonarola replied, demanding to be judged at Florence. However, he, for some time, respected the censures, and abstained from preaching. But, after six months, being asked by the magistrates, who were all *frateschi*, to reappear in the pulpit, and reconvert the people, who, in the interval of his silence, had resumed their gayeties, he yielded to the temptation, and boldly defied his excommunication. On Christmas he celebrated the customary three Masses of that festival, gave the Eucharist to his religious, and, after a solemn procession around his convent,² announced that he would at once resume his preaching in the cathedral. When this new departure was made public, the vicar-general, in the absence of Rinaldo Orsini, Archbishop of Florence, convoked the Chapter of the cathedral, and a prohibition to assist at the proposed sermons was issued to all the clergy; the parish-priests were ordered to inform the faithful that, owing to the censures hanging over Savonarola, any one who attended his discourses would incur the same penalties. In spite of this action of the Chapter, the friar announced that he would follow the inspiration of God.³

From this moment Savonarola was at a disadvantage. People felt, and he must have felt, that his rebellion destroyed the influ-

¹ Alexander VI. said to Bonsi, envoy of Florence: "I have read the sermons of your friar, and have talked with those who have heard them. He dares to say that the Pope is a broken sword; that he who believes in excommunication is a heretic; that he himself, sooner than ask for absolution, will go to hell. He has been excommunicated, not because of false insinuations, nor at anyone's instigation, but for his disobedience to our command that he should enter the new Tusco-Roman congregation. We do not condemn him because of his good works; but we insist that he ask pardon for his petulant arrogance, and we will gladly accord him absolution when he humbles himself at our feet."

² For some time Savonarola had been prior of the Convent of St. Mark.

³ Nardi, b. ii., p. 42.

ence, by weakening the authority, of his words. To obviate this difficulty he now attacked the validity of his excommunication, declaring, first, that the censures of a wicked Pope are of no weight ; second, that Alexander had excommunicated him without reason ; third, that the censures were pronounced against the " sower of tares," and he was not such a one.¹ The arguments with which he defended these propositions were of the weakest kind, and to reassure his partisans, he, one day, had recourse to a device which was terribly impressive. With the Holy Eucharist in his hand, he called upon God to consume him with fire from heaven if he was deceiving the people, and if the Pope's censure, in his case, was valid. At this time, says Christophe, " his talent certainly appears great, but we can divine that he is not at ease, not sure of himself. Savonarola perceives, in the minds of his hearers, difficulties which disquiet them, and to which he is compelled to respond. He invents trivial similes that he may excite their laughter ; he encumbers himself with suppositions ; he advances hazardous and equivocal principles, the consequences of which he would certainly repudiate." In fact, from the day that Savonarola openly defied the Holy See, his waning eloquence and deficient logic proved that he well realized his false position.

When the news of the friar's daring rebellion reached Rome, Pope Alexander threatened serious measures against Florence if the delinquent were not sent to the Eternal City. The republic partially yielded. Savonarola was commanded to keep silent, but his disciple, Friar Dominic of Pescia, continued to preach in the strain of the master, and his rashness precipitated the ruin of both. One day a Franciscan friar, named Francis of Puglia, while preaching in the church of Santa Croce, declared that Friar Jerome was an impostor, adding that he was ready to try the " ordeal by fire " with the said Jerome. At that moment Friar Dominic was holding forth in the church of St. Lawrence, and the news of the Franciscan's challenge was immediately carried to him. He at once informed his hearers, and accepted the defiance. When Friar Francis found himself called upon to make good his boasting offer, he lost courage, and tried to escape by pleading that he had challenged Savonarola, not Dominic. This incident was painful to Savonarola, but how could he disavow his companion when he himself had often declared that if his arguments did not produce conviction of the truth of his teaching, he was ready to invoke the supernatural in its defence ? He accepted the challenge, and for himself, but insisted that a Papal legate and all the foreign ambassadors should be present at the ordeal ; furthermore, he demanded

¹ *Sermon for last Sunday of Lent.*

* Nardi: b. ii., p. 44.

that if he came unharmed out of the fire, the Church should at once be reformed. Friar Francis refused these conditions, but the factions had entered into the spirit of the thing, and the mob would not miss the show. The impetuous Dominic, unlike the timid Francis, was panting for the terrible trial, and there were many Franciscans more brave, or more confident, than their brother. Finally, the affair was laid before the magistrates, and they decided that the ordeal should be held. As champions the magistrates designated, on the part of Savonarola, Friar Dominic, and on the part of the Franciscan challenger, a lay-brother named Julian Rondinelli. Certain propositions, the truth or falsity of which was to be established, in the opinion of many, by this curious means, were drawn up by Dominic. They were: "The Church needs reformation. She will be chastised. She will be renovated. Florence will be punished, but she will afterwards prosper. The infidels will be converted. All these things will soon happen. The excommunication of Savonarola is null." The magistrates then appointed ten citizens, five for each party, as a commission to settle any differences that might arise, and all was ready for that trial, the worth of which we doubt, but which, in those days, commanded the confidence of the people.¹ Previous to the experiment, however, the magistrates sent messengers to Rome to obtain the Pontiff's consent to the undertaking. A consistory was held, and the authorization was refused; Alexander simply wrote to the Franciscans, praising their devotion to the Holy See, and encouraging them to continue in their combat against error.²

On April 7th, 1498, in the centre of the Square of the Magistracy (in modern times, Square of the Grand Duke), was to be

¹ The Church never authorized or approved of ordeals, but, they being recognized in the laws of the barbarians, she was obliged to tolerate them. The prejudices of humanity are not easily eradicated; witness the number of superstitions in our own day, and among the most cultivated. As far back as the ninth century Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, wrote against the *damnable* opinion that God interfered in the ordeals; in the eleventh, Ivo of Chartres supports his condemnation of them by a letter of Pope Stephen V. to the bishop of Mayence. Popes Celestine III., Innocent III., and Honorius III. condemned them, as did also the Fourth Council of Lateran. The scholastic theologians teach that they are injurious to God, and favorable to lies. As for the question, whether or not there was ever anything of the supernatural in the frequent success of these ordeals, see an excellent dissertation in the *Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions*, v. 24.

² In reference to this request of the magistrates of Florence, the Abbé Christophe says that he is astonished to find that Carle, in his *History of Friar Jerome Savonarola* (Paris, 1848), cites the letter of Alexander VI. as an approbation of the proposed ordeal. "If we rightly understand the words of the Pontiff," adds Christophe, "they do not contradict the testimony of the historian (*Miscellanies* of Baluze, v. iv., Burlamachi, p. 132), who affirms that the decision of the consistory was averse to the authorization. They simply contain a eulogy on the *fervor, zeal, devotion* displayed by the Franciscans in their struggle with Savonarola."

seen an immense scaffolding, paved with bricks, and covered with combustible material. Two tribunes arose before it, destined to be occupied by the magistrates and by the friars of the two Orders. The square was filled with anxious spectators, the house-tops were crowded. At the appointed hour Rondinelli, at the head of a long file of Franciscans, and Dominic of Pescia, flanked by Savonarola, and followed by a procession of Dominicans, entered the square, and took their places. It was observed that Savonarola carried a silver pyx, containing the Holy Eucharist. Rondinelli advanced to the magistrates, and cried out: "Behold me ready for the ordeal. Sinner that I am, I know the flames will consume me. But let not Friar Dominic, therefore, boast of victory; he must take his turn in the fire. If he comes out unharmed let him be proclaimed the conqueror; otherwise, no."¹ The judges replied that his demand would be granted. Then ensued a curious scene. The referees feared that the champions might have concealed some charms under their robes, and ordered them to change them for others handed to them. Rondinelli was perfectly willing, but at first Dominic hesitated. "Never mind," cried the Franciscan, "his robe will burn with his body." Then the Dominican changed his garments, but retained a crucifix. When he was ordered to lay it down, Rondinelli said: "Let him keep it—it is of wood, and will burn with the rest." Then Savonarola handed the Holy Eucharist to Dominic. But the crowd, believing that the flames would, perforce, respect the Blessed Sacrament, declared that if the Dominican were allowed to carry it, the trial would not be fair.² Savonarola persisted, and threatened to abandon the ordeal. An endless dispute ensued, and the promised spectacle vanished in ridicule.

This fiasco was the signal for the fall of Savonarola, for one cannot trifle with the mob. Had he not been protected by the Holy Eucharist, the agitator would not have regained his convent in safety. In vain he mounted the pulpit to pacify the crowd; his eloquence was not heeded, for all now felt that Savonarola was but an ordinary mortal. The day after was Palm Sunday, and, while one of the Dominicans was preaching in the cathedral, a crowd of young men burst upon the congregation, a voice cried: "To St. Mark's!" and in a few moments the convent was attacked. The magistrates, tired of him who had made them, more than winked at the outbreak, and ordered the few laymen who had rushed to defend the Dominicans, out of the building. The doors were burnt away, and the mob rushed in search of its prey. Savonarola

¹ Nardi, b. ii., p. 48; Burlamachi, p. 140; Anonymous *Life of F. Jerome Savonarola* (Geneva, 1781), c. 26.

² Nardi, b. ii., p. 45; Nerli, p. 78; Anonymous author, *supra*, pp. 101, 102.

was found in prayer before the Blessed Sacrament, in company with the imprudent Dominic of Pescia. He was saved from the crowd by some municipal commissioners, and, together with Dominic, lodged in prison; a few hours afterwards Friar Sylvester Maruffii was also arrested.

Information of Savonarola's imprisonment was immediately sent to Pope Alexander, and he ordered the magistrates to send the friar to Rome. Had the command been heeded, the unfortunate man would, doubtless, have been confined, perhaps even for life, but the catastrophe would have been averted. The magistrates now appointed a commission of six citizens and two canons (these latter as Papal commissaries) for the trial of the three Dominicans; nearly all were declared adversaries of the accused. The trial lasted from the 9th to the 19th of April. During the first interrogatories Savonarola was firm and collected, but when, in accordance with the detestable and foolish custom of the time, he was put to "the question," as the torture was called, he quite naturally weakened.¹ "Here," says Christophe, "we experience a painful uncertainty. What confidence are we to place in the avowals made by the accused? Although the *Acts* of the trial are printed with the title, *Authentic Copy of the Trial of Jerome Savonarola*, and although the signature of the friar is found at the end, there are strong presumptions against the value of the admissions they contain. Firstly, the composition of the tribunal, the preamble of the interrogatory, the testimony of historians,—all prove that the proceedings were not conducted with the calm impartiality of justice. Secondly, it is certain that Savonarola more than once retracted, and showed much vacillation, during the course of his interrogatory; that he frequently declared, in presence of the Papal commissioners, that what he had said and predicted was the simple truth, and that his own contradictions had been extorted by the fear of torture; that he acknowledged that torture would force him to admit whatever his enemies might wish, because he knew himself to be unable to support such pain. Hence the Pontifical representatives were much embarrassed. Finally, the commission has been accused of having falsified the depositions of Savonarola, they having realized the impossibility of obtaining real facts sufficiently serious, and it is said that a notary, called *Scr Ceccone*, aided in this odious stratagem. It is true that it is an apologist of Savonarola who asserts this,² and that we should mistrust the testimony of those who trembled before

¹ The characteristic sneer of Roscoe that the torture is the "last reason of theologians" is uncalled for, for in what civil tribunal, down to the last century, and in part of that, was it not used?

² Burlamachi: pp. 155-160.

the visions of the friar ; but we find the same accusation, formulated, with no less directness, in several contemporary historians who had not the same interest as Burlamachi in attacking the equity of the commission." In fact, Nardi asserts (b. ii. p. 47) that "at the time, and afterwards, there was much doubt as to the truth and quality of the proceedings," and, that he himself may not be accused of hiding the truth, he narrates the following anecdote: "A noble citizen, who had been one of the examiners of the said friars, and who had been chosen because of his enmity to them, was met by me in his villa ; and being questioned by me, with deliberate intention, concerning the truth of the said proceedings, he ingenuously replied, in the presence of his wife, that it was true that in the report of Friar Jerome's trial some things had been omitted and some things added."¹

When the examination had come to an end, the magistrates deliberated as to the sentence to be passed upon the unfortunate religious. A few wished to refer the matter to the Pontiff, as the accused were ecclesiastics, and besides, they were leniently disposed, and thought that the friars' only chance of escaping the death penalty lay in their being placed in Alexander's hands. But the majority insisted that the culprits could not be accorded any ecclesiastical immunity, as they were excommunicated. The party of severity carried the day, and Pope Alexander was requested to appoint commissioners to preside at the sentence and its execution. The Pontiff commissioned Joachim Turriani, the general of the Dominicans, and Francis Ramolina, an auditor of the governor of Rome, and after some interrogatories they ratified the proceedings, and the friars were declared guilty of schism, heresy, persecution of the Church, and seduction of the people. They were sentenced to be burned at the stake. On May 23d Florence witnessed the last act of this terrible drama. In the square of the Grand Duke, where two months before Savonarola had seen his credit destroyed, another apparatus was now arranged for his death. Early in the morning the three friars went to confession, received Holy Communion with every manifestation of a sincere piety, and marched out to their last earthly suffering. Arrived in the square, they had to undergo the humiliating ceremony of degradation, being deprived, one at a time, of all their sacerdotal vestments. Burlamachi and Nardi assert that the prelate, whose duty it was to perform this act, said to Savonarola: "I separate thee from the Church militant and triumphant;" and that the unfortunate firmly and loudly replied: "From the Church militant, yes—from the Church triumphant, no!" The three friars were then asked

¹ For other writers who bring the same charge against the commission, see Muratori, *Annals of Italy*, p. 1498.

whether they accepted the plenary indulgence which the Pontiff accorded them, and they all three bowed their heads and answered in the affirmative. They were then strangled, and their bodies reduced to ashes, which, to prevent any superstitious veneration, were thrown into the Arno.¹

The following reflections of Christophe on the character of Savonarola are worthy of the reader's attention: "Certain names have a fatality attached to them—we can neither praise them nor blame them by halves. Some make a fanatic, a sectarian, an impostor, of Savonarola; others, an apostle, a saint. The fact is, there is something of all these in the Dominican. If we open the door of his cell in St. Mark's and there contemplate him at the foot of the crucifix, attenuated by fasting and drowned in an ecstasy of prayer; if we follow him to Santa Maria del Fiore and hear him reproaching voluptuous Florence with her vices, Savonarola is a saint, an apostle. But if we turn to the other side, and behold the tribune who mixes politics with religion, the declaimer who inveighs against the existing powers, the seer who opposes a divine mission to the authority of the head of the Church, Savonarola is very like a fanatic, a sectarian, an impostor. Unfortunately he finished his life with the latter character; such was the impression he left with the spectators when he left the scene, and we may well ask ourselves whether, if he had preserved the popular favor, he would have anticipated the role of the monk of Wittenburg. Protestants appear not to doubt it, for they claim Savonarola as one of their forerunners. But they forget that this monk broke the link which might have connected him with their rebellion, on the day when, at the foot of the stake, he accepted the absolution of the Pope, and handed down to posterity that tardy but solemn proof of his repentance. . . . Savonarola knew not how to be either saint or apostle. We would hesitate to call him a sectary, and we would dislike still more to style him an impostor. We regard him as a sincere, but a prodigiously imaginative preacher. If we have studied him rightly, he appears to have been carried away in the current of an unregulated imagination from the day when he began his prophetic exposition of the Apocalypse to that when he openly substituted for the authority of the Church that of his own pretended celestial mission. Undoubtedly his eloquence is wonderful, but it is that of a vehement declaimer rather than that of a solid and enlightened teacher. We see in it the violent and convulsive agitation of a fever, rather than an effort of powerful and healthy thought. His strength does not warm; it burns, it boils over like the lava from a volcano. It does not illumine,

¹ Razzi: *MS. Life of Savonarola Sanuto*; loc. cit., b. 6.

it dazzles; it does not guide, it pulls; it does not march, it tumbles. His spirit cannot understand the positive side of things. Savonarola is seldom true; exaggeration seems to be his domain; his figures are colossal, his situations forced, his end greater than his means. We need not be surprised if a man so organized, with such power of imagination and such weakness of sense, influenced by the enthusiasm which drinks his words, and by an idolatrous worship accorded him,—if such a man becomes intoxicated with himself, . . . and if he believes himself to be the envoy of the Lord. Savonarola succumbed to the hatred of factions which he had excited against himself. In our days he would have succumbed to ridicule."

Protestants have frequently spoken of Savonarola as a precursor of the "Reformation." Luther insisted that the unfortunate Dominican taught the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and in 1523 he caused Savonarola's meditation on the 70th psalm to be circulated throughout Germany, together with a preface by himself, in which he declared that Friar Jerome was his forerunner, "although some of the theological mud yet stuck to the feet of the holy man." He asserts that Savonarola taught his own cardinal doctrine, and that "*for this reason* he was burnt by the Pope," and he adds: "Christ canonized him because he did not rely upon vows or a cowl, upon masses or a rule, but upon meditation on the gospel of peace; and covered with the breastplate of justice, armed with the shield of faith and the helmet of salvation, he enlisted, not in the Order of Preachers, but in the army of the Christian Church." Savonarola was not put to death by the Pope, nor was his fate owing to the cause alleged by the ex-Augustinian, and the very work upon which the latter relies to prove his point shows the former's orthodoxy in the doctrine of grace. Luther draws comfort from the following passage: "I will hope in the Lord, and soon I shall be freed from all tribulation. And by what merit? Not by mine, but by Thine, Lord. I offer not my own justice, but I seek Thy mercy. The Pharisees gloried in their justice; hence they had not that of God, which is obtained by grace alone, and no one will ever be just before God, merely because of having performed the works of the law. Soldier of Christ, what is your mind in these combats? Have you faith, or not? Yes, I have (you answer). Know then that this is a great grace of God, for faith is His gift, and not for our works." But this passage is explained by its continuation, for, meditating upon the next verse, "Incline Thy ear unto me, and save me," Savonarola says: "Let thy sorrow show, if it can, one sinner, even the greatest one, who has turned to the Lord, and has not been received and justified. . . . Hast thou not heard the Lord saying that whenever a sinner weeps,

and grieves for his sins, He will not remember his iniquities? . . . Hast thou fallen? Arise, and mercy will find thee. Art thou being ruined? Cry out, and mercy will come." That Savonarola's belief concerning grace was far from the Lutheran, is shown by the *Rule for a Good Life*, which, when requested by his jailor to leave him some souvenir, he wrote on the cover of a book. In it he says: "A good life depends altogether upon grace; hence we must *strive to acquire it*, and when we have received it, we must try to increase it. . . . It is certainly a free gift of God; but examination into our sins, and meditation on the vanity of worldly things, prepare us for grace; confession and communion dispose us to receive it. . . . *Perseverance in good works*, in confession, and in all that disposes us to grace, is the true and sure means to increase it." Protestants who would like to claim Savonarola as a precursor of the Lutheran movement, should attend to the following passage, taken from the fourth book of his *Triumph of the Cross*. "Since Peter was made His vicar by Christ, and was constituted by Him pastor of the whole Church, it follows that all the successors of Peter have the same power. And since the bishops of the Roman See hold the place of Peter, it is evident that the Roman Church is the leader and mistress of all the churches, and that the entire congregation of the faithful should be united with the Roman Pontiff. He, therefore, who differs in doctrine from the unity of the Roman Church, certainly recedes from Christ. But all heretics differ from that Church; therefore, they are out of the right path, and cannot be called Christians. He is to be styled a heretic who perverts the sacred pages and the doctrine of the Holy Roman Church, and, following the sect of his own choice, obstinately perseveres in it. As has often been said, truth agrees with truth; all truths confirm each other. But heretics so differ among themselves that they agree in almost nothing; it is very plain, therefore, that they are strangers to truth. However, the doctrine of the Roman Church, in all that pertains to faith and morals, is one; and although Catholic teachers are almost innumerable, they neither depart from that doctrine nor wish to differ from it. The kingdom of Christ and of the Church militant is not only established to endure until the end of the world; after the renovation of the universe, it will exist forever, as the Gospel and all the Scriptures and the monuments of the saints testify. Heretics, who have bitterly persecuted Catholics, have not been able to preserve their lines against the Roman Church, but have been utterly routed, together with their depraved dogmas and the obstinacy of their followers. It is certain, then, that their false volumes come not from God, that their doctrine is not Christian."

In 1548 the celebrated Dominican, Ambrose Catarino (Lancellotto Politi), published at Venice a *Discourse against the Doctrine and Prophecies of Friar Jerome Savonarola*, in which he drew attention to many propositions which he deemed contrary to Catholic teaching; but he declared that he did "not combat Savonarola, who was worthy of compassion rather than of blame, but only his errors, which yet survived in the minds of those who, not without scandal and danger to their souls, believed in him."¹ Probably in consequence of this work, Pope Paul IV. ordered an inquiry into Friar Jerome's works, and when the commissioners read to him some extracts, he exclaimed: "Why, this is Martin Luther!" But after the examination was finished, the only decision pronounced was a "suspension" of fifteen of the sermons and of the dialogue on *Prophetic Truth*. And in the *Index* of the Council of Trent these works are prohibited only "until corrected," which certainly implies that they contain only accidental, not essential, errors.

The sermons of Savonarola were placed upon the Roman Index "until corrected," but his other works are animated by a spirit of the most tender piety, and are thoroughly orthodox. His *Triumph of the Cross* consists of four books on the evidences of Christianity, and is written in a vein of calmness very surprising to one who has just been subjected to the fire of the author's sermons. His five books on the *Simplicity of the Christian Life* are preceded by an epistle to the citizens of Florence, in which he thus describes his work: "I shall try to adopt natural reason, rather than the authority of the divine writings. And I shall do so, because of the incredulous, the wise ones of this age, that is to say, the philosophers and orators, the poets and others of inflated intellect, who think that the Christian life is superstition, and that its simplicity is foolishness; also, because of the condition of our unhappy age, in which faith has grown so weak, and the supernatural light has been so nearly extinguished, that I am unable to decide whether those who acknowledge their belief merely regard it as an affair of opinion, and hold it because it was taught them in childhood, or whether they really cling to it as something taught by supernatural authority. I hesitate in pronouncing upon the faith of Christians of to-day, for charity has grown cold, and the fruit of

¹ Catarino had a perfect mania for scenting heresy nearly everywhere and in nearly every author. He even denounced to the Faculty of Paris many propositions of the great Thomas de Vio (called Cajetan, from his birthplace and See of Gaeta). But he was well rebuked by Bartholomew Spina, master of the apostolic palace, who, when Catarino was named to a bishopric, brought forth fifty propositions, taken from the zealot's writings, which, the critic insisted (though without reason), were heretical.

good works does not appear. But since the natural light does not fail in man, so long as he acts according to natural reason, let the intellect, at least, of these people be convinced, and let them understand that the Christian life is truth and simplicity; that it is not foolishness, but the wisdom of God; perhaps, then, they will cease to calumniate it. I trust, however, in the Lord Jesus, that you will find in this book nothing contrary to Holy Writ, or to the sayings of the holy Doctors, or to the teaching of the Holy Roman Church, to whose correction I have always submitted, and do submit; but that you will discover in it the full truth, which came down from heaven to our fathers who everywhere preached it, and left it to us in writing, confirmed by signs and miracles."¹

In this work Savonarola leads his reader to come, in each book, to a certain number of *Conclusions*. Thus, in the first book, the conclusions are as follows: The Christian life is that in which the doctrine of Christ is followed, and His conduct imitated. It is better than any other which can be found or excogitated. It is not founded in any natural love. Nor is it based on the sensitiveness of man. Neither is it founded on the sole natural light of reason. It proceeds from no natural cause. It proceeds from no spiritual creature. Its root and foundation is the grace of God. It tends, with all its powers, to augment and preserve the gift of grace. For these ends, prayer is a better means than any other good work. The devout and frequent use of the sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist furnish the best means to preserve and to augment the gift of grace. The second book treats of simplicity of heart; the third, of exterior simplicity; the fourth, of rejection of superfluities, and of almsgiving; the fifth, of the happiness of the Christian life. The *Meditations* on the Psalms, *Miserere*, *In Te Domine speravi*, and *Qui regis Israel*, form, to use the words of the Dominican censor of the edition before us, "a honeyed book, full of the sweetness of piety, and it cannot be read without fruit if it is read attentively." This book is peculiarly interesting from the fact that Savonarola composed it while in prison. The following touching prayer is prefixed to the meditation on the *Miserere*. "Unhappy me! I have offended heaven and earth, and am destitute of help. Where shall I go? To whom shall I turn? Who will have mercy on me? I dare not lift my eyes to heaven, for I have grievously offended heaven. I find no refuge on earth, for I have been a scandal to earth. What then shall I do? Shall I despair? God forbid! God is merciful, God is piteous, my Saviour is kind. God alone, then, is

¹ *Works of Friar Jerome Savonarola*; Grenoble, 1666, vol. ii.

my refuge; He will not despise His work; He will not spurn His image. To Thee, therefore, most kind God, I come, sad and dejected; Thou alone art my hope, my encouragement. But what shall I say to Thee, since I dare not raise my eyes? I must pour forth the words of contrition, and implore Thy pity, crying: *Miserere!*" Another interesting work of Savonarola's is a dialogue between the soul and a spirit, entitled *The Solace of My Journey*, the tone and object of which may be gathered from the first sentences: "*Spir.* I am now thinking of returning to my home, to see the God from whom I was banished; but thou shalt go with me, my spouse. *Soul.* But I know not the way to so great a joy. *Spir.* Our way is Christ. *Soul.* But faith wavers. *Spir.* He who approaches God, should believe that He is. *Soul.* And yet, he that is hasty to give credit, is light of heart (*Eccles.*, xix. 4). *Spir.* But to believe in God is the part of gravity and of wisdom. *Soul.* Has God ever spoken to thee? *Spir.* I believe those to whom He has deigned to speak. *Soul.* But how do you know that they heard God speaking? *Spir.* Miracles have proven it. *Soul.* Miracles have ceased; what then shall persuade me? *Spir.* Doubtest thou that God is? *Soul.* Many doubt, for no one has ever seen God (*John*, i. 18). *Spir.* But such have no intellect, according to the Psalmist (xiii. i.): 'The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.' *Soul.* How canst thou prove that God is? . . . I admit the force of thy argument, but I ask, . . . what is God? *Spir.* If carnal men could know what God is, He could not be God. For we can only know tangible and sensible things; God is not one of these, nor can He be presented to our intellects as He really is; it is sufficient that we know what He is not . . . *Soul.* Thy words have convinced me, and I already yearn for the sight of God; but I ask myself, what if God does not grant it? Has He promised to thus bless those who love Him? *Spir.* Let what thou hast now learnt suffice for to-day. The night approaches; let us seek our abode in silence, and pray God that to-morrow thou mayest acquire more of the science of salvation." The first book of this Dialogue, as we have seen, treats of God; the second, of the truth of the faith; the third, of the Messiah, against the Jews; the fourth, of the articles of faith, against philosophers; the fifth, of the reasons of probability which favor the articles of faith; the sixth, of the future life; the seventh, of heaven.

We now ask the reader's attention to the following remarks of Cantù: "A man of faith, of superstition, of genius, Savonarola abounded in charity. Contrary to Luther, who confided entirely in reason, he believed in personal inspiration. From his works

may be taken arguments both for and against him; and by comparing them, we may perceive how he sought to harmonize reason with faith, the Catholic religion with political liberty. He never denied the authority of the Holy See, although he resisted him whom he regarded as an illegitimate Pope, and against whom he invoked a Council which should reform the Church. Vanity of applause and impatience of contradiction led him to excess, but he acted with a pure conscience and from no personal ambition. He did not try to propagate his ideas by force, but by example; that is, he believed in the power of truth He thought to guide the crowd by means of its passions, and, as always happens, he became the victim of these passions. He alone is a heretic who obstinately defends something contrary to what is defined to be of faith. The fame of Savonarola remained suspended between heaven and hell, but his end was deplored by all, and perhaps first by those who had caused it. In the churches of Santa Maria Novella and San Marco he is depicted as a saint, and Raphael placed him, in the *Loggie* of the Vatican, among the Doctors of the Church; portraits of him were kept and venerated, not only by the pious of Florence who continued to oppose corruption and its consequent slavery, but even by great saints It is said that Clement VIII. swore, in 1598, that if he succeeded in acquiring possession of Ferrara, he would canonize Savonarola. Serafino Razzi, a Dominican of Florence, and infatuated with Friar Jerome, often exhorted the Pontiff to this step, and when he saw the thing put off, he procured a little donkey, and, septuagenarian though he was, started, during the Jubilee, for Rome. But the Pope, 'fearing much opposition,' would not see him, and would not allow him to publish the *Life of Savonarola* that he had written; in vain had the Dominicans prepared an *office* for the friar.¹

¹ *The Proper Office for Friar Jerome Savonarola and his companions, written in the 16th century, and now published for the first time, under the auspices of Count C. Capponi, with a Preface by Cesar Guasti.* Prato, 1860. We subjoin three of the *Lessons* from this *Office*. "Lesson vi. When the work of preaching was confided to Jerome, having been instructed by divine revelation, he announced the future calamities of Italy and the coming renovation of the Church. While the king of France was menacing the Florentines, the man of God was sent to him to appease him by his prudence and his sanctity; he went to Pisa, and persuaded Charles VIII. Returning to Florence, he began to promulgate the divine will with an eloquence which hitherto he had not possessed, and with such effect that it seemed miraculous." "Lesson vii. His soul was often so united to God that his body become insensible to material things, was, as it were, dead. During the last ten years of his life he prepared none of his sermons before he had received the divine instructions as to what he should say. Who can describe his fluency of speech, the sublimity of his eloquence,

"If the philosophical Naudet called him a modern Arius or Mohammed, the devout Father Tournon thought him a messenger of God; Sts. Philip Neri and Catharine de Ricci venerated him as blessed, and Benedict XIV. deemed him worthy of canonization. *Not one of the followers of Friar Jerome became a disciple of Luther or a betrayer of his country's liberty.* Michael Angelo, who raised bastions for his native city and the greatest temple in Christendom, always venerated Savonarola. Machiavelli, who never embraced any opinions not in vogue, admired him at first; he commenced to ridicule him only when he himself had fully developed a policy that was diametrically opposite to that of the friar, namely, a policy without God, without Providence, without morality—an innate depravity, though without original sin and without a Redeemer—and which expected to regenerate Italy, not only without the Church, but in spite of the Church."¹

Much has been written for and against Savonarola's claims to the gift of prophecy. It is certain that very many wise and cool-headed men among his contemporaries credited his predictions; for instance, Pico della Mirandola, Marcilio Ficino, and St. Philip Neri. The reader may be interested in the following remarks of the prudent and observing Philip de Commines: "I have already told how a Friar-Preacher, or Jacobin, a resident of Florence for fifteen years, and enjoying a reputation for great sanctity—whom I conversed with in 1495—Jerome by name, foretold many things which afterwards happened. He had always insisted that the king would cross the mountains, and he publicly declared that this and other things had been revealed to him by God. He said that the

the majesty of his expression? His voice was clear; his gesture animated; his countenance, not ardent, but really inflamed. Through him peace was made among citizens; the morals of men were so changed that they seemed to be other persons. The young, imbued with Christian simplicity, did nothing impure; in their pious zeal, they roused the indolent, penetrated into their houses, seized upon their vicious books and pictures, and burned them in the presence of the multitude." "*Lesson viii.* As his fame increased, just so did the number and ardor of his enemies. At length, a crowd attacked the convent of St. Mark, demanding the person of Jerome; but the gates were defended by the armed men surrounding the friar. Then the convent was assailed, Jerome kneeling at one of the altars, praying for friends and enemies. Fire opened a way for the besiegers, and they penetrated into the convent, destroying everything they met. The magistrates, informed of these excesses, took charge of Friars Jerome, Dominick and Sylvester. Jerome was imprisoned, and though twice subjected to the torture, refused to retract his predictions. Finally, the wicked man caused him and his two companions to be strangled and burnt; his ashes were thrown into the Arno, but his soul took up its abode in heaven." As late as August 20th, 1593, an archbishop of Florence, writing from Rome to the grand-duke Ferdinand I., complained of the recitation of this Office by the friars of St. Mark's, but he admitted that the recitation was private.

¹ *Heretics of Italy*, Discourse xi.

king had been chosen by God to reform the Church by force, and to chastise the tyrants (of Italy); and because he declared that he knew these future things by revelation, many murmured against him, and he acquired the hatred of the Pope and of many of the Florentines. His life was the most beautiful in the world, as every one could see, and his sermons against vice converted many in that city to a good life, as I have said. At this date of 1498, when King Charles died, Friar Jerome also passed away—four or five days intervening between the two deaths, and I will tell you why I note the date. He had always publicly preached that if the king did not return into Italy to accomplish the task God had assigned him, God would cruelly punish him; and all these sermons were printed and sold. And this same threat of cruel punishment had been often written to the king, before his death, by the said Jerome, as the friar himself told me in Italy, saying that the sentence of heaven was pronounced against the king, if he did not accomplish God's will, and did not restrain his soldiers from pillage. He predicted many true things concerning the king and the evils to befall him; the death of his son, and his own; and I have seen the letters to the king."¹ On May 13th, 1495, the Duke of Ferrara wrote to Manfredi, his agent at Florence, that he had understood that Friar Jerome "had said, and says, many things about the present affairs of Italy, and it appears that he threatens the Italian princes. And since he is a virtuous person and a good religious, we greatly wish to know what he has said and says, with all particulars; we desire you to see him, and to request him, in our name, to tell what he thinks is to happen, especially in matters concerning us." And Savonarola replied that he would pray to God, and then answer the duke. On August 8th, 1497, this same prince wrote to the friar: "We declare to you that we have never doubted the future occurrence of all the things you have predicted."

¹ *Memoirs*, b. viii., c. 3.

SCRIPTURE POETRY.

A GENERAL acquaintance with the artistic structure of the Hebrew poems is essential for an adequate understanding of the sacred text. Much discussed problems are, however, involved even in a superficial study of Scripture poetry. The rattling of ancient cymbals and kettle-drums, and the whole music band of savage nations, are still ringing in the ears of many as loudly as they rang in the ears of Herder's Alciphron. For them David still dances before the ark, and the prophets summon a player that they may feel his wild inspirations. Others expect to find in Hebrew poetry that beauty which they find in the odes of Horace and of Pindar. They imagine that there exists a series of rules of Hebrew prosody as may be found in our larger Latin and Greek grammars for the prosody of the classic languages. We shall not attempt to settle all doubts, and answer all arguments brought up by the advocates of either side, but shall endeavor to point out the results obtained through the serious investigations of the more eminent men of both parties.

Before entering upon the technical structure of Hebrew poetry, we must know the sacred poems that have come down to us. Besides the Psalms, the books of Job and of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle of Canticles, we possess shorter poems in the song of Lamech to his two wives,¹ the blessing of Noah,² of Melchisedech,³ of Rebecca's kinsfolk,⁴ of Isaac,⁵ of Jacob,⁶ the song of Moses after crossing the Red Sea,⁷ the victory song of Israel,⁸ the triple blessing and prophecy of Balaam,⁹ the swan-song of Moses,¹⁰ his solemn blessing of all the tribes of Israel,¹¹ Deborah's song of victory,¹² the song of Anna, the mother of Samuel,¹³ the lament of David over Saul and Jonathan,¹⁴ David's thanksgiving for his delivery from the hands of all his enemies and from the hand of Saul,¹⁵ his last words,¹⁶ the canticles of Tobiah¹⁷ and of Judith.¹⁸

¹ Gen. 4, 23, 24.

³ Gen. 14, 19, 20.

⁵ Gen. 27, 28, 29.

⁷ Exod. 15, 1-18.

⁹ Num. 23, 7, ff.

¹¹ Deut. 33, 2-29.

¹³ 1 Kings, 2, 1-10.

¹⁵ 2 Kings, 22, 2-51.

¹⁷ Tob. 3.

² Gen. 9, 25, 27.

⁴ Gen. 24, 60.

⁶ Gen. 49, 2-27.

⁸ Num. 21, 27-30.

¹⁰ Deut. 32, 1-43.

¹² Judg. 5, 2-32.

¹⁴ 2 Kings, 1, 19-27.

¹⁶ 2 Kings, 23, 2-7.

¹⁸ Judg. 16, 2-21.

To these must be added several passages of the prophets, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, for instance, Isaiah 38, Jonah 2, Habakuk 3, probably Daniel 3, 52-90, and several others concerning which the learned have not yet agreed. The second book of Kings¹ speaks of "a Book of the Just," which is now lost; but from a short quotation of it, given in Jos. 10, 12, it appears to have been a poem. The third book of Kings² tells us that Solomon spoke three thousand parables, and composed a thousand and five poems, which also are lost to us. In the New Testament we meet three passages which might be termed poems: The Magnificat,³ the Benedictus,⁴ and the Nunc dimittis.⁵ The spoken Hebrew text of these canticles not being preserved, it is impossible to determine whether their poetic structure is the same as that of the Old Testament poems.

All Scripture poems may be divided into two classes—lyrical and didactic. The Psalms are mainly lyrical, while the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes are didactic and sententious. The book of Job and the Song of Solomon are treated in a rather dramatic way; De Wette Schrader,⁶ Ewald,⁷ Delitzsch,⁸ and several others, especially among the Rationalists, maintain that Job and the Canticle of Canticles are dramas in the strict sense of the word. How the name drama, in its common acceptation, can apply to the two books in question we are not told by the learned upholders of their dramatic nature.

We have come now to a much discussed problem, the technical structure of Hebrew poetry. Many authors, discontent with the unsatisfactory and unconvulsive arguments advanced for the different theories on the subject, assign but vague and meaningless characteristics to our sacred poems. Nordheimer⁹ may serve as an instance of this. "The most important features," he says, "which distinguish Hebrew poetry from prose consist in the nature of its subjects, its mode of treating them, and the more ornate character of its style, which again give rise to peculiarities in the structure of sentences and in the choice of words." And again: "The sacred Hebrew muse, maintaining her primitive simplicity, lays down no arbitrary laws of versification with which to fetter the genius of the poet; she requires of her votary neither more nor less than that he should find himself in that state of excited and exalted feeling which is necessary to the production of all genu-

¹ 1, 18.

² 4, 32.

³ Luc. 1, 46-55.

⁴ Luc. 1, 68-79.

⁵ Luc. 2, 29-32.

⁶ Einleitung, p. 515.

⁷ Die poetischen Bücher des A. T., ed. 2, p. 73 ff.

⁸ Commentar über das Buch Job, Leipz., 1876, p. 15.

⁹ Hebrew Grammar, ii. 320.

ine poetry, and should possess the power of delineating his emotions with truth and vigor." After dwelling, then, at some length on the universal features of poetic composition, he adds: "These primitive and fundamental characteristics of poetry in general, viz., a constant brevity of expression, and a reinforcing of the sentiments by means of repetition, comparison, and contrast, have ever remained the principal and almost the sole distinguishing features of the poetry of the ancient Hebrews. Accordingly the attention of modern investigators of the subject has been directed chiefly to ascertaining and classifying the different modes in which this mutual correspondence of sentences and clauses of sentences, termed parallelism, is exhibited in every species of poetical composition." Parallelism, therefore, without any arbitrary laws of versification to fetter the genius of the poet, is, according to Dr. Nordheimer, the distinguishing feature of Hebrew poetry.

After the clear and learned investigations of Lowth,¹ the different kinds of parallelism are fully ascertained and classified. Synonymous, antithetic, and synthetic parallelisms are its principal divisions. Synonymous parallelism consists in the repetition of an idea in nearly the same, or in different words, in a positive or a negative clause, in every second or every third line; in the last case, when, namely, the first clause answers to the third, and the second to the fourth, or when the first and second clauses correspond with the third and fourth, the parallelism is said to be doubled. Instances are common; Psalm 103, 1-4 may serve to illustrate simple parallelisms:

1. { When Israel went out of Egypt,
The house of Jacob from a barbarous people,
2. { Judea was made his sanctuary,
Israel his dominion.
3. { The sea saw and fled:
Jordan was turned back.
4. { The mountains skipped like rams,
And the hills like the lambs of the flock.

Further explanation is hardly needed; Israel and the house of Jacob, Egypt and a barbarous people, the sea and the Jordan, the mountains and the hills, lambs and the rams of the flock, are brought into opposition. An instance of double synonymous parallelism we find in Psalm 26, 1-3:

1. The Lord is my light and my salvation,
2. Whom shall I fear?
3. The Lord is the protection of my life:
4. Of whom shall I be afraid?

¹ De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum Praelectiones, 1753 et 1763. There is an English translation of this valuable work by Gregory, with notes by the translator, from Michaelis and others, London, 1787.

1. If enemies in camp should stand against me,
2. My heart shall not fear.
3. If a battle should rise against me.
4. In this will I be comforted.

Here we notice the mutual correspondence of the first and third, the second and fourth lines, constituting what is named double parallelism. We find at times three, four, or even more lines in the required mutual correspondence, *e.g.*, Psalm 90, 5, 6.

Thou shalt not be afraid of the terror of the night,
Of the arrow that flieth in the day,
Of the business that walketh about in the dark,
Of invasion, or of noon-day devil.

Antithetic parallelism consists in such a mutual relation of the clauses or sentences that the second is the converse of the first. The Book of Proverbs 11, 1 ff. may serve as an instance of this kind of poetry:

1. { A deceitful balance is an abomination before God;
And a just weight is his will.
2. { Where pride is, there also shall be reproach,
But where humility is, there also is wisdom.
3. { The simplicity of the just shall guide them,
And the deceitfulness of the wicked shall destroy them.
4. { Riches shall not profit in the day of revenge;
But justice shall deliver from death.

What could be more striking than the opposition between the deceitful balance and the just weight, between the abomination before the Lord and the will of God, between pride and humility, reproach and wisdom? The strong contrast between lines of this kind of parallelism makes the thought very clear and impressive, provided it be not continued too long.

In synthetic or progressive parallelism the inspired writer, keeping his main idea always in view, develops and enforces it by accessory ideas and modifications. The praise of the law of God, as read in Psalm 18, 8-10, is a striking example:

The law of the Lord is unsponsored—converting souls:
The testimony of the Lord is faithful—giving wisdom to little ones.
The justices of the Lord are right—rejoicing hearts;
The commandment of the Lord is lightsome—enlightening the eyes.
The fear of the Lord is holy—enduring for ever and ever:
The judgments of the Lord are true—justified in themselves.

The whole passage intends to praise and celebrate God's law; but this main idea is brought home to the reader and enforced by the accessory idea of the divine justice and the fear of God, and

by the diverse beneficent effects of God's commandments on the soul of man.

If this kind of parallelism is used to a great length, without being interrupted by either of the two kinds of lines above mentioned, it is hardly distinguishable from good prose. Hence, examples of poetry in which two, or even all three kinds of parallelism intermingle, are by far the more numerous. The words of God, in which He mapped out the mission of Isaiah the prophet, illustrate this principle of mixed parallelism, as they illustrate many another principle of both ascetic and psychological life. We read, Isaiah 6, 8 f., "And I heard the voice of the Lord, saying: whom shall I send? and who shall go for us? and I said: Lo, here am I, send me. And he said: Go, and thou shalt say to this people:

	Hearing hear and understand not:
	And see the vision and know it not,
1	1 Blind the heart of this people,
2	2 And make their ears heavy,
3	3 And shut their eyes:
3	4 Lest they see with their eyes,
2	5 And hear with their ears,
1	6 And understand with their hearts,
7	7 And be converted, and I heal them."

The first two verses are, at the same time, progressive and anti-thetic; the six lines that follow present a beautiful example of introverted mixed parallelism. In the first three lines, as well as in the second three, the ideas are progressive, while synonymous correspondence is had between the third and fourth, the second and fifth, and the first and sixth lines. The seventh line expresses the one main thought which God wished to convey, and for whose emphasis He made use of all the intermediate accessory ideas. The piece, taken as a whole, is therefore synthetic.

From the very nature of parallelism, it is clear that Hebrew poetry is, to a great extent, divisible into couplets and triplets; and these may be called its natural stanzas. A perfect instance of couplets we find in the fifth chapter of Lamentations, while the first, second, and third chapters of Lamentations are written in triplets; a glance at the Hebrew text of the Old Testament will verify this. In most inversions the beauties of the original poetic structure are destroyed by the introduction of paraphrases, or by a double rendering of the same clause, or by a wrong division of verses, stanzas, and even chapters. In one case, we may obtain an idea of the original from the English version:¹

¹ Lam. I, 1 f.

1. How doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people!
How is the mistress of the Gentiles become a widow;
The princes of provinces made tributary.
2. Weeping she hath wept in the night, and her tears are on her cheeks:
There is none to comfort her among all them that were dear to her;
All her friends have despised her and are become her enemies.

We might continue quoting the first three chapters of Lamentations, dividing each verse into triplets of synonymous, synthetic, or antithetic lines. Lamentations 5 may, as was said above, be divided into couplets of such parallel sentences:

1. Remember, O Lord, what is come upon us:
Consider and behold our reproach.
2. Our inheritance is turned to aliens:
Our houses to strangers, etc.

Often, several parallel lines are thrown into one stanza, though Hebrew stanzas do not seem to have obeyed as strict metrical laws as do the stanzas of Latin and Greek poets. But this being as yet uncertain, we shall have to speak of it again when treating of the more recent views on Hebrew metre. That the inspired writers purposely divided some of their pieces into such longer and more artificial stanzas is plain from certain refrains occurring at regular intervals in several Hebrew poems. Thus we find, in Psalms 41 and 42, which constitute properly only one psalm, the refrain: "Why art thou sad, O my soul? and why dost thou trouble me? Hope in God, for I will give praise to him: the salvation of my countenance and my God," repeated three times, namely, Psalm 41, 6 and 12, and Psalm 42, 6, five verses intervening between the three several repetitions, and constituting as many regular stanzas. In the same manner is Psalm 45 divided into three, and Psalm 56 into two stanzas.

Another sign of artistic design in the building up of stanzas in Hebrew poems may be seen in the alphabetical arrangement of several of them. Its simplest form consists in making the initial words of the first lines begin with the letters of the alphabet in regular order. This is the case in Psalms 111 and 112, Psalms 9, 25, 34, etc.; Lam. 4, Proverbs 31, 10-31, are also alphabetical, but in such a way that every distich or tristich begins with a different letter. In some cases, the third chapter of Lamentations, for instance, the first letter begins the initial words of the first three verses, the second letter the initial words of the second three verses, continuing thus in regular alphabetical order. Psalm 118 is still more remarkable, because each letter in succession commences eight verses, indicating that each stanza of the psalm comprises eight verses. The peculiarity of the alphabetic poetry of Sacred

Scripture cannot be exhibited in a literal version, but the translators have tried in several instances, as in Psalm 118 and Lamentations 1, 2, 3, 4, to compensate the reader by prefixing the names of the Hebrew letters in alphabetical succession to their corresponding stanzas or verses. Prof. Bickell¹ enumerates fifteen sacred poems of the Old Testament in which the alphabetical arrangement is observed. Whether, beyond indicating the proper division into verses and stanzas, this structure had any meaning, cannot now be determined. Some think it was employed to strike the ear and thus to deepen the impression; others represent it as a mere aid of the memory. Prof. Bickell suggests that it indicated the exhaustive treatment of a subject.

We must conclude, therefore, that our sacred writers often intentionally and artistically joined their parallel doublets and triplets into more lengthy stanzas, even where they are not expressly indicated by references or by alphabetical arrangement. It is not difficult to see that in Psalms 3, 4, etc., two distichs are united into one stanza; in Psalms 91, 112, etc., three; in Psalms 120, 121, etc., four; in Psalms 131, etc., five; and in Psalms 96, etc., six. All Hebrew poetry being subject to the law of parallelism, as we saw above, it may happen that stanzas are formed without regard to the number of lines, but merely according to the number of parallel verses. In Psalm 2, *e.g.*, we have four stanzas consisting of three verses each, though the number of lines be seven, six, eight, eight, respectively. In some psalms there is a seeming redundancy of verses. Psalm 6, for instance, consists of four stanzas, preceded and followed by a single verse; but the preceding single verse² contains the subject matter of the following three stanzas, while the last stanza prepares the way for the closing verse. In Psalm 13, too, whose third verse according to the Vulgate reading is taken from other psalms and prophecies, we may distinguish four stanzas followed by a single closing verse which comprises the burden of the whole psalm.

Thus far we have considered peculiarities of Hebrew poetry concerning the substance of which there is but little or no doubt. As we advance now, we shall find ourselves travelling more uncertain roads. All admit the existence of Biblical poems; all admit, too, that in poetry we naturally and necessarily require rhythm. The question then arises: In what does Hebrew rhythm consist? Rhythm³ according to its primary meaning signifies number, but number necessarily supposes a unit numbered. In rhythmical language, then, we must look for the unit, the repetition and num-

¹ Innsbruck Theol. Zeitsch., 1882, p. 320.

² 6, 2.

³ ῥυθμός, *numeus*.

ber of which produces what is called rhythm. This unit may be either an idea or it may be a sound. If it is an idea, we obtain the parallelism which thus far we have been considering. It may not be out of place here to draw attention to the fact that rhythm of ideas produces a more universal beauty than can be obtained by rhythm of sound, for ideas remain identical, whether the poem be translated or not, while sound changes, and the sound unit once destroyed, rhythm, of course, vanishes. It becomes clear from this why, even in the versions of the Scriptural poems, there is found so much poetic beauty, for it owes its existence to the rhythm of ideas or to parallelism. On the other hand, every one acquainted with the original of our sacred poems knows that they possess, in Hebrew, a charm which is entirely missing in the versions. This cannot be the result of parallelism, since the ideas are the same in version and original; nor can it result from a special clearness and force of language in the original, our versions being commonly much more easily understood than the Hebrew text. Therefore we rightly look in Hebrew poetry for rhythm of sound besides the rhythm of ideas. This conclusion, reached by a process of elimination, we might have drawn from two general principles of Aristotle,¹ that, namely, everything without rhythm (number) is unlimited, and that everything unlimited is hard to know and unpleasant. The original of sacred poetry, even apart from the ideas, not being unpleasant, we necessarily seek for sound-rhythm in it, if Aristotle's principles be right.

Our last conclusion was, that in the Hebrew text of Sacred poetry there exists a certain sound-rhythm; consequently there is a sound-unit, from the repetition of which we have rhythm. What can be this sound-unit? Articulate sound may be considered merely as an articulate-unit, or it may be measured by the time required to pronounce it, or it may be classified according to the relative intensity with which it is pronounced, or, finally, it may be considered according to the vocal elements entering its composition. The articulated unit or syllable, the length or quantity of the syllable, its relative intensity or accent, and, finally, its component vocal elements, afford as many possible units of sound-rhythm. French poetry, for instance, counts the number of syllables; Latin and Greek poetry takes into account the quantity of the syllable; the German and Slavonic poets are guided by the syllabic accent; while the unit of similar vocal composition of the syllable, or rhyme, is used as an additional rhythmical emphasis in many languages.

One more remark we must premise: Rhythm must not be con-

¹ Rhetor. b. 3, c. 8.

founded with metre. All metre is, indeed, rhythmical, but not all rhythm is metre. Venerable Bede in his book, *De Metris*, following in the footsteps of S. Augustine,¹ tells us that metre is "ratio cum modulatione," while he defines rhythm, "modulatio sine ratione." The whole passage may be found in Vossius.² Rhythm, therefore, in its wide sense does not require an absolutely equal number of units, but it is content with a relatively proportionate number. Rhythm of proportion is required even in prose, as Aristotle asserts in the above quoted chapter. We must determine, therefore, in the first place, whether rhythm of sound, merely in its wide sense, occurs in Sacred Scripture, or whether we also find there metre in the proper sense of the word; and, if metre proper exists in Sacred Scripture, what is the sound-unit of its rhythm?

Omitting all probable *a priori* arguments in favor of the existence of metre, properly so-called, in our sacred poems, arguments to be found in Vossius³ where he discusses Aristotle's view of poetry and its essential constituent parts, we may at once proceed to enumerate facts, from which the existence of Hebrew metre in its strict acceptation follows with great probability. Such facts are: The existence of metre proper in several cognate Semitic languages, the psychological necessity of metre in song accompanied by dancing, the division of many sacred poems into regular stanzas, the directions given in Holy Writ itself that certain psalms are to be chanted after the melody of others, which seems quite meaningless if mere cantillation were in question. We must add the testimony of St. Jerome, who speaks of heroic verse, hexameters, trimeters, and tetrameters, when treating of Sacred poetry.⁴ He even compares the Psalms to the iambic and alcaic verses of Horace and Pindar, and tells us that Psalm 118 and the long Mosaic poems are written in hexameters of sixteen syllables to the line. Flav. Josephus⁵ maintains that the songs of Moses, in Exodus 15 and Deut. 33, are written in hexameter verse, the Psalms in trimeter and pentameter. Here is the place to state the reasoning of Dr. J. Ecker of Münster⁶ against Dr. Bickell's system of Hebrew metre, which, in reality, is valid against the existence of any kind of metre in sacred poetry. If metre ever existed, how could its knowledge be lost, since the poems were of almost daily use in temple and synagogue? Professor Bickell answered

¹ Lib. iii, de Musica.

² Tom. v, inst. poet. l. 1, c. 8, § 12.

³ Tom. 5, de arr. poet. natura ce. 2 et 3.

⁴ F. Praep. Evang. xi. 5 (M. 21, 852)—Praef. in lib. Job; ad Paulam ep. 30, 3 (M. 22, 442)—Praef. in Euseb. Chron. (M. 27, 223).

⁵ Antiq. ii. 16, 4; iv. 8, 44; vii. 12, 3.

⁶ Literarischer Handweiser, N. 320, September, 1882.

the objection¹ by citing a similar instance. The syllabic, rhythmic, and strophic structure of the Greek Church hymns had been entirely forgotten by the Greeks themselves, though the hymns had continued in daily liturgical use. Cardinal Pitra was the first to rediscover the metrical nature of the hymns. The learned Professor observes that such a forgetfulness must have been much easier among the Hebrews, psalmody proper ceasing with the destruction of the temple, and being replaced later by the mere recital of psalms in the synagogues. We must also call attention to the fact that not all Hebrew poems were songs, many of them belonging to didactic poetry.

The probable existence of regular metre in our sacred poems being taken for granted, we may proceed to consider the different metrical systems proposed at various times as the true keys to Hebrew poetry. The view, that in some Hebrew poems rhyme was intended, may be passed over in silence, since real rhyme occurs so rarely that its occurrence is more easily explained by chance than by any rule of art. Those taking interest in this peculiarity may find instances of it in Ps. 8, 5; Is. 33, 22; Judg. 14, 8; Gen. 4, 23 f.; Numb. 10, 35, etc. Instances of alliteration are more frequent. Dr. Julius Ley, of Halle, proposed, in 1863, alliteration as the general system of Hebrew poetry, but being left alone in his theory, he himself abandoned it and became the advocate of a more satisfactory system.

The vocal elements of the syllable cannot, therefore, be considered as the true unit of Hebrew sound-rhythm. Nor were the remaining three elements of sound, the syllable, its accent, its quantity, which we recognized above as possible units of sound-rhythm, left untried. Since Josephus, Eusebius, Philo, and St. Jerome had asserted that in sacred poetry the verses and feet corresponded to the feet and verses of classic poetry, attempts were made to scan the Psalms accordingly. In 1637 appeared at Lyons the "*Lyre of David*," by Fr. Gomar. The learned author finds in the Psalms instances parallel to certain portions of Sophocles and Pindar. Lud. Capellus, in his "*Critica Sacra*," proved this theory to be untenable. The same system was proposed by C. G. Anton,² and of late by A. F. Manoury.³ William Jones⁴ modified the system a little according to the canons of Arabic instead of classic poetry. All closed syllables, *i.e.*, syllables ending in a consonant, he considers as long, all open syllables, *i.e.*, syllables ending in vowels, as short. He admits the spondee, the iambus,

¹ *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, Innsbruck, 1882, iv., 789.

² *Conjectura de metro Hebraeorum antiquo*, Lips., 1770.

³ *Lettre sur la versification Hebraïque*, Bar le Duc, 1880.

⁴ *Poeseos Asiaticae Commentarius*, London, 1774.

the trochee, the pyrrichius, the anapest, the bacchius, the amphimacer and the molossus, as possible single feet, which he then joins in all possible ways into compound feet. After scanning six or eight lines he consoles us with the assurance that he supposes Job 28, the Lament., the songs of Moses, and Deborah, also might be scanned in the same fashion. We cannot but smile at the candor of W. Jones, when he admits not to be able to do justice to this subject without spending an infinite amount of labor and time at it, which he says he cannot spare. Expressing his satisfaction with himself for having opened a new road to the true beauty of Hebrew poetry, he leaves to us all the infinite labor required to reach that beauty.

It seems, then, that besides the vocal composition of the syllable, we must discard also syllabic-quantity as the possible unit of Hebrew sound-rhythm. Next follow the attempts to scan the Scripture poems according to accent, or the relative stress of the syllable. That the written Massoretic accent cannot be taken as the leading principle of Hebrew versification, is evident. If it were, it should have been introduced from the beginning, while it dates from several centuries after Christ; it should be of the same nature in all poetic pieces, while one system of accentuation is followed in Psalms, Job, and Proverbs, another in the rest of sacred poetry; finally, in the different editions of the same poetic passages, e.g., Psalm 17 and 2 Kings, 22, 2, Psalms 13 and 52, etc., we should find the same accents, which is not the case. The fruitless attempts of E. J. Greve,¹ and of I. A. Bellermaun² to scan sacred poetry according to accent, may be seen in Rosenmüller.³ Dr. J. Ley, of Halle, proposed in 1875⁴ the system of applying to Hebrew poetry the canons of the old German versification—to count, namely, the number of accented syllables in the line, allowing any number of unaccented syllables to intervene between the single accents. We may accent a given word or not, according to the needs of the metre; in case of necessity, we may admit even a double accent on the same word. When verses are too short, they are called catalectic; and when too long, an anacrusis-accent⁵ is not counted. With all these licenses, the divisions of the verse cannot be brought into harmony with the divisions of the sense. At times, most closely connected words must be separated, even single words split, in order to construct verses and stanzas. Dr. Neteler⁶ had

¹ *Ultima capita l. Jobi—accedit tractatus de metris Heb. poeticis, Davent., 1788.*

² *Versuch über die Metrik der Hebräer., Berlin, 1813.*

³ *In Lowth de sacra poesi Heb., Lips., 1815, p. 434 f.*

⁴ *Grundzüge des Rhythmus, des Vers und Strophenbaues in der Hebräischen Poesie.*

⁵ *Auftact.*

⁶ *Anfang der Hebräischen Metrik der Psalmen, Münster, 1871.*

tried the same theory without allowing as many poetic licenses, and with a correspondingly less amount of success.

Ch. A. Briggs, Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York, began a series of articles on Hebrew metre in the April number of *Hebraica*, 1886. His theory may be summed up in the following words, taken from his first article: "Hebrew poetry . . . counts the words and measures by the beats of the accent . . . Maqqeph's must be inserted wherever the rhythm requires it, for this is a device whereby two or more words are combined under one rhythmical accent." Professor Briggs measures his lines, therefore, according to accent; he admits only one accent in a given word. But, if the metre requires it, he unites two or more words into one by means of Maqqeph, avoiding thus the inconvenience of wholly unaccented words. To avoid double accents on the same word he omits existing Maqqeph's, thus splitting compound words into their component simple ones. These changes of the Massoretic text presupposed, he proceeds to illustrate his system by scanning instances of Hebrew trimeter, tetrameter, pentameter, etc. The system, therefore, does not differ from that of Drs. Neteler and Ley, excepting that it introduces an arbitrary Maqqeph instead of an arbitrary accent.

The weakness of Ley's system was shown in the *Lit. Centralblatt*¹ in a criticism coming probably from the pen of Dr. Merx, of Jena. The critic proves that not the Massoretic verse but the hemistich is to be considered as poetical unit of the stanza; that the verse division ought to coincide with the division of sense, and that syllables ought to be counted instead of accents. Applying these principles to the Book of Job,² he advanced the study of Hebrew metre more than it had advanced for over a century before him. But his system, too, has its weak sides. It disregards all accent, and it requires only an approximately equal number of syllables in the corresponding hemistichs; for the inequality of syllables, in the author's view, was counterbalanced by the melody of song.

We see that, in the systems thus far considered, the vocal composition of the syllable, its quantity, its accent, the syllable itself, are severally looked upon as units of sound-rhythm, and that the result is not satisfactory; either because the sacred poems cannot be scanned according to the proposed systems, or because the systems allow too many licenses to satisfy an honest inquirer. Well, then, might thorough students follow a hint of Gregorius Bar Hebraeus,³ informing us that other Syriac doctors, Isaac, namely, and

¹ 1876, n. 32.

² Gedicht von Hiob, Jena, 1871.

³ Ethic. par. i. cp. 5, sect. 4, as quoted in Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, tom. i. cp. 8.

Balai, composed several songs according to the Davidic verse, or the verse of the Psalms. From the technical structure of the poems of Isaac and Balai, therefore, we may learn the technical structure of the Psalms, and consequently of all other sacred poems. The Syriac poems were pointed out in another way as the key to the Hebrew poems. Cardinal Pitra¹ rediscovered the metre of the sacred Greek hymns by applying the metrical canons of the Syriac Madrosche in their scanning, and these in turn he supposes to have been modeled on Hebrew psalmody. Their close similarity to the therapeutic songs, as described by Philo, was the basis of Pitra's supposition.

The canons of Syriac metre are to be found in the introduction of Bickell's "*Sti. Ephraemi Carmina Nisibena*."² Without entering into technical details, it suffices for our purpose to know that Syriac verse disregards quantity, and counts the number of syllables, every second of which is accented, the metrical accident coinciding with the verbal. Hence we find only iambic and trochaic feet in Syriac verse. Vowels are sometimes rejected, sometimes inserted, sometimes contracted. Prof. Bickell proceeded next to apply these canons to sacred song, and succeeded beyond all expectation. He published, or rather announced, his theory in the "*Innsbrucker Theol. Zeitschrift*,"³ explained it more fully in his "*Metrices Biblicae Regulae*,"⁴ extended it to all poetical passages of the Old Testament in his "*Carmina V. T. metrica*,"⁵ which he afterwards supplemented at various times in the "*Innsbrucker Theol. Zeitschrift*."⁶ G. Gietmann, S. J., in his "*De re metrica Hebraeorum*,"⁷ follows the same system of scanning, though he differs in details from Bickell. The system is adopted as the true one by men like A. Rohling,⁸ H. Lesèvre,⁹ J. Knabenbauer, S. J.,¹⁰ F. Vigouroux,¹¹ and others of no ordinary reputation. Nor can Bickell's system be called new, for, besides Bar Hebraeus, who spoke of it as of a thing beyond dispute, Fr. Hare¹² had proposed the same system, at least in substance. He admitted only dissyllabic feet, made no account of syllabic quantity, and accepted only the iambic and trochaic movement like Bickell; unlike Bickell, but like Gietmann, he did not require that the end of the metrical line

¹ *Hymnographie de l'Église Grecque*, Rome, 1868.

² Leipzig, 1866, pp. 31-35.

⁴ Geniponte, 1879.

⁶ 1885, p. 718 ff.; 1866, pp. 205 ff, 355 ff, 546 ff.

⁸ *Das Salomonische Spruchbuch*, Mainz, 1879, p. 24 and 385 ff.

⁹ *Le Livre des Psaumes*, Paris, 1883, p. 23 ff.

¹⁰ *Commentar. in lib. Job*, Parisiis, 1885, p. 18.

¹² *Psalmorum liber in versiculos metrica divisus, Cum dissertatione de antiqua Hebraeorum poesi*, London, 1736.

³ 1878, pp. 791 ff.

⁵ Geniponte, 1882.

⁷ Friburgi, 1880.

¹¹ *Manuel bibl.* ii. p. 203 ff.

should coincide with the division of the sense. Lowth,¹ in his matter-of-fact criticism, felt bound to reject Hare's system entirely, and ever after it was "to dumb forgetfulness a prey." The post-humous work of Le Hir² presents, in the essay preceding the translation of Job, a system of scanning almost identical with the system now under consideration. Had the modest priest of Saint-Sulpice lived he would, no doubt, have succeeded in explaining all our sacred poetry accordingly.

The historical outlines of this system being clear, we may proceed to illustrate it by a few instances taken more or less at random from Prof. Bickell's work. We shall give the transliterated Hebrew text, only remarking that the consonants are pronounced as in English, the pronunciation of the vowels being like the continental European pronunciation:

PSALM 150.

Hallélu él bekódsho—Praise ye the Lord in his holy place:
 Hallúhu bírki 'úzzo—Praise ye him in the firmament of his power.
 Hallúhu big'buróthar—Praise ye him for his mighty deeds:
 Hallúhu K'róbguðléhu—Praise ye him according to the multitude of his greatness.
 Hallúhu b'théka' shórar—Praise ye him with sound of trumpet:
 Hallúhu b'nébel v'kinnor—Praise ye him with psaltery and harp.
 Hallúhu b'thof umáchol—Praise ye him with timbrel and choir:
 Hallúhu b'mínnim v'úggab—Praise ye him with strings and organ.
 Hallúhu b'zílz'le sháma'—Praise ye him on high sounding cymbals:
 Hallúhu b'zílz'le th'rua'—Praise ye him on cymbals of joy.
 Kol hánn'shamá t'hallél yah—Let every spirit praise the Lord.

We notice, at once, that each Hebrew line consists of seven syllables, and that the feet are of the iambic movement. The psalm is, therefore, rightly called iambic heptasyllabic. Wherever a little accent, curved from right to left, is placed between two vowelless consonants, the intervening vowel of the Massoretic text is suppressed, a perfectly allowable process according to the canons of Syriac metre. In the scanning of the Psalms, Bickell found it necessary to reject in this way about 1600 vowels; he had to omit, also, 1550 syllables of the common Massoretic reading, and to add about 1070.³ We must, however, remember that in many of these instances the change is owing to the fact that two grammatical forms express the same relation. Thus, *ô* is often exchanged with *éhû*, both being the pronomial affix of the third person, masculine, singular. The biblical parallel passages, too, serve to lessen the shock we experience at first hearing of so many changes. The 17th Psalm, for instance, though a mere repetition

¹ De sacra poesi Heb., Lips. 1815, p. 403 and p. 699 ff.

² Le livre de Job, Paris, 1873.

³ Innsbrucker Theol. Zeitch., 1882, p. 789 ff.

of 2 Kings, 22, changes 76 words, omits 19, adds 15, transposes 1, and transposes, also, a line. Bickell, in scanning Psalms 33, 34 and 76, changes only 6 and omits 6 words; in Psalm 78, 1-50 (a), he changes 4, omits 13, and adds 3 words; in Psalms 105 and 26 he changes 3, omits 12, and adds 5 words; in Psalms 147-150, and 24, 7-10, he changes 4, omits 4, and adds 5 words; in Deut. 32, 1-35, he changes 5 and omits 2 words, and transposes a line; in Job 38, 2-39 and 15, he changes 5, omits 3, adds 4, and transposes 1 word; in Proverbs 10, 1-11 and 23, he changes 2 and omits 1 word. It must be remembered that each of these seven instances is exactly equal to Psalm 17 and 2 Kings 22, *i.e.*, consists of 112 heptasyllabic lines, and that proposed emendations which do not influence the metre must not be brought as arguments against the metrical system in question. On the whole, then, not one-ninth of the number of changes found in the cited parallel passages of the Bible is required to render possible an exact scanning of the sacred poems according to the rules of Syriac metre.

Setting aside, therefore, all anxiety for the integrity of our sacred text, we may consider a few more instances, illustrating the same metrical principles. Psalm 18, 8-15, presents a beautiful example of compound metre. Each stanza consists of four iambic verses, the first and third of which are heptasyllabic, the second and fourth quadrisyllabic:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Toráth yahvéh temíma
Meshí bath náp'sh
'Edúth yahvéh ne'mána
Machkímáth p'thí | 1. The law of God is holy,
Converting souls;
The word of God is faithful,
Instructing fools. |
| 2. Píqúde yahveh y'shárim
Mesámm'che léb,
Mizváth yahveh berúea
M'iráth 'enáim. | 2. God's justices are righteous,
Rejoicing hearts.
The law of God is lightsome,
Enlightening eyes. |

It may be interesting to know that the Syriac poet Cyrillonas has employed the same metre and stanza.

In the last place, we add a specimen of a more artificially constructed stanza found in Psalm 5. Each stanza consists of six iambic lines, the first, fourth, and fifth being heptasyllabic, the second quadrisyllabic, the third hendecasyllabic, the sixth euneasyllabic. The Psalm reads:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. 'Marái ha'zína, yáhveh
Biná h'gigi.
Haqshiba l'qól shaví', malki
velóhai;
Ki éthpallél élécha.
Yahvéh, boq'r tishma 'qóli;
Boq'r éroch lécha váazáppe. | 1 Give ear, O Lord, to my words,
And hear my cry.
My king and God! O, hear the voice
of prayer,
My prayer to thee ascending.
My morning prayer hear thou,
At morning, when I stand before thee. |
|---|---|

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>2. Ki lô el cháphez rásh'otá;
 Lo y'gúrcha rá'.
 Lo yithyazz'bù hol'lim lenág'd
 'enécha;
 Sanéthá kol po'ólé av'n.
 Teábbed dóbre cházab;
 Ish dāmim v'emírma y'thá'eb yáhveh.</p> | <p>2. Thou art not God of evil,
 Sin is not thine,
 And sinners shall not dwell before
 thee present;
 Thou hatest the ungodly,
 Destroyest all deceivers.
 God hates the cruel and deceitful.</p> |
|--|--|

Stanzas like these invariably remind one of the strophes and antistrophes of Greek choruses.

We must not imagine, however, that all difficulties have been successfully overcome. The many changes of the Massoretic text necessary to scan the sacred poems according to the principles of verse just indicated, is in itself a serious stumbling-block, opposing the progress of the new system; the difficulty increases when a change of sense is necessary that influences the dogmatic value of a passage. If the words of Psalm 44, 7, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," from which St. Paul¹ draws an argument for the divinity of Christ, have to be changed to "the foundation of thy throne is firm; the Lord hath strengthened it forever and ever," as Prof. Bickell changes them, the new system destroys St. Paul's argument, and must, therefore, be abandoned. Nor can we approve of the plan of Father Gietmann,² who allows fewer changes of the Massoretic text, but does not insist on the verse divisions coinciding with the sense divisions. Parallelism would thus be destroyed. If, then, the canons of Syriac metre really are the laws of Hebrew verse, there must be a way of applying them without injuring either the dogmatic value of the sacred text or its beautiful parallelism. Let us hope that Professor Bickell may soon be able to analyze all Scripture poems, avoiding both inconveniences. Meanwhile we must be grateful to the special students of this branch for the light they have thrown on both sense and beauty of the inspired writers by their untiring endeavors.

¹ Heb. 1, 8.

² De re metrica Heb., Friburgi, 1880.

LULWORTH CHAPEL, BISHOP CARROLL AND BISHOP WALMESLEY.

- Records of the English Province S.J.* By Henry Foley, S.J.
English Catholic Hierarchy. By W. Maziere Brady. Rome. 1877.
Life of Bishop Milner. By Provost Husenbeth. Dublin. 1862.
History of the Church in England. By Canon Flanagan. London. 1857.
Historical Memoirs. By Charles Butler, Esq. 2d ed. London. 1819.
Supplementary Memoirs. By Dr. Milner. London. 1820.
Collections, etc. By V. Rev. George Oliver, D.D. London. 1857.
Collectanea S.J. Exeter. 1838.
Archdiocesan Archives. Baltimore.
Catholic Directory. London. 1802.
The Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll. By Dr. John G. Shea. New York. 1888.
History of the Royal Society. By C. R. Weld, London, 1837.

IN St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, is preserved a Latin document, endorsed "Certificate of Consecration at Lulworth Castle of J. Bp. of Balt^{re}, August 15th, 1790."¹ This year will witness the first centenary of the erection of the metropolitan See of the United States. To the many who are interested in the early days of the American Church, a translation of this document, together with some details illustrative of the memorable scene of which it is the simple record, will, we hope, be not unwelcome.

Done into English, the certificate is, substantially, as follows:

"By these presents we testify that, assisted by the Reverend Charles Plowden and the Reverend James Porter, priests, we did, in the chapel of Lulworth Castle, Dorsetshire, England, on Aug. 15th, 1790, the Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, confer Episcopal consecration upon the Reverend John Carroll, Bishop-elect of Baltimore, the Apostolic Letter, given under the seal of the Fisherman at St. Mary Major's, November 6th, 1789, having been read, and the oath having been taken by the Prelate-elect, according to the Roman Pontifical.

Given at Lulworth, August 17th, 1790.

- † CHARLES WALMESLEY, Bp. of Rama, V.A.,
- † CHARLES PLOWDEN, Assistant-priest,
- † JAMES PORTER, Assistant-priest,
- CHARLES FORRESTER, priest, Missionary-Apostolic,
- THOMAS STANLEY, priest."

¹ It has recently been printed, in Dr. John Gilmary Shea's new volume.

At the time of Dr. Carroll's election to the Episcopate, his friend and former associate in the Society of Jesus, the Reverend Charles Plowden, was resident at Lulworth Castle, in the capacity of tutor to the sons of the proprietor. As soon as he got news of the appointment, and he got them very early, Father Plowden wrote to the Bishop-elect.

After tendering his congratulations, he goes on to say: "We wish to know where you are to receive the sacred character. We conceive that, considering the speedy and easy communication with this country, you will prefer a voyage hither to a trip to Quebec or Havana. France is one universal scene of riot and confusion. Mr. Weld orders me to invite you to Lulworth Castle, where he will assemble three bishops to meet you. He will think his castle and new chapel honored by the consecration therein of the first bishop of North America."

This letter bears no date.

November 1st, 1789, Fr. Plowden writes: "The present vacancy in the See of Havana will, we hope, be an additional motive for accepting our invitation to Lulworth, which is again earnestly renewed."

April 4th, 1790, he says: "I expect news of the arrival of your Bulls by the January packet, and of the measures which you mean to take for your consecration. We hope to receive your first Episcopal benediction in this chapel."

Dr. Carroll, having decided to seek consecration in England, sailed thither early in the summer of 1790. In London, where he remained some weeks after his arrival, he received a letter from Father Plowden, who says: "Mr. Weld desires that you will not put yourself to the expense of a pectoral cross, as he has one ready to present to you which he hopes you will accept and like. It is rich, curious and respectable, formerly the property of the last Abbot of Colchester."

On August 3d Father Plowden again writes: "Mr. Weld begs of you the favor to borrow two Pontificals in London, and bring them with you. Bishop Walmesley will be here next Thursday to stay some weeks. You need not, therefore, hurry yourself.

But, three days later, he says: "Bishop Walmesley arrived yesterday. He is not well, and seems rather alarmed about the state of his health. He desires me to tell you 'that, not knowing what may happen,' he wishes you to arrive at the Castle, and be consecrated as early as may suit your convenience. I can only say that the old Bishop wishes that no time be lost."¹

The ceremony of consecration was performed nine days later,

¹ Dr. Walmesley was the senior Vicar-Apostolic, and Lulworth was in his district.

on the Feast of the Assumption, with a degree of splendor unusual in those days. It was only in *private* chapels, like those at Lulworth and Wardour, that the vestments and other appurtenances requisite for such a function were to be had. Even High Mass was rarely seen outside of London. Mr. Weld charged himself with all the expense incident to the occasion. His generosity is all the more worthy of remembrance from the fact that the houses of most of the distinguished Catholics in England were at that time closed against the Vicars-Apostolic.

Mr. Weld was not able to assemble three prelates for the occasion, despite his promise to do so. Of the four Vicars, two had recently died, and the third was in poor health. In accordance with the tenor of Dr. Carroll's Bulls, Bishop Walmesley was assisted by Fathers Plowden and Porter, some time members of the suppressed Society of Jesus.¹ Before the ceremony began, Father Plowden delivered his memorable address, a discourse in every way worthy the solemn occasion that called it forth. The preacher had grasped the full import of the scene about to be enacted. To our generation, which beholds the fulfilment of what he foretold, his words seem little short of prophetic.

It was agreed upon between Mr. Weld and the Bishop-elect that the proceedings of the day were not to be made public. Nevertheless, Father Plowden's sermon soon appeared in the local newspapers. A letter of his to Bishop Carroll dated Lulworth, September 5th, 1790, explains how this came about. The discourse was published without the preacher's knowledge or consent. Bishop Walmesley, owing to his deafness, had been unable to follow the speaker, so, when the ceremony was over, he sent Father Forrester to borrow Father Plowden's manuscript for him. Before it was returned, somebody surreptitiously made a copy.

The chapel of St. Mary of the Assumption at Lulworth is the sanctuary where our hierarchy took its immediate rise. It stands in the park, a short distance from the Castle. A description thereof is given in Hutchins's *History of Dorset*. But that description is, *salva reverentia*, scarcely satisfactory. The following, drawn from a study of plans and photographs kindly furnished the writer by Miss Agnes F. Weld, of Lulworth Castle, will, perhaps, convey a better notion of the building than is afforded by Hutchins. It is

¹ In his edition of Palmer's "Church of Christ," New York, 1841, Bishop Whittingham, of Maryland, says, *apropos* of Dr. Carroll's appointment to the See of Baltimore: "There are very serious difficulties affecting the regularity and even the validity of the ordination of the above-mentioned Carroll, and all the Romish clergy of the United States derived from him, in consequence of his ordination having been performed by only one titular bishop, Dr. Walmesley, who appears to have labored under a similar irregularity or deficiency himself."—vol. i., p. 286, note.

about seventy-six feet long by sixty-one feet wide. Externally, the central feature of the structure is a rectangle forty feet long by about forty-five feet wide, crowned by a dome and lantern. From the cornice at each angle springs a square turret capped by a large stone vase. The two transepts are of the same height as the kernel of the building, are in ground-plan sections of circles, and have domed roofs intersecting the central dome near its base.

What one, judging from outside appearances, would take to be the altar-end, is really the vestibule. This, like the transepts, is a section of a circle, but of greater radius. The east end, where the sanctuary and sacristy are located, is rectangular, about twenty feet long by thirty-two feet wide. The chancel is a semicircle with a radius of twelve feet. But, as the altar-rail is placed some little distance in front of the chancel-arch, the sanctuary is sufficiently roomy. Like the vestibule and transepts, the chancel has a domed roof. Its walls are decorated in the Byzantine style, and the church is ornamented by fine paintings brought over from Italy. The space roofed by the central dome is the main auditorium. The altar is magnificent. Bronze and gold, porphyry and rose alabaster, the rarest and most beautiful marbles are lavished upon it.

The chapel is built of cut stone, and is of two stories. Over the porch, on the eastern gable, is carved the armorial shield of the founder.

It is of Romanesque design. Dr. Milner, who ought to have known better, calls it "Grecian." Though, of course, incomparably smaller, the chapel much resembles, in general outline, the Cathedral church at Baltimore. Cardinal Gibbons told the writer that, on his visit to Lulworth some years ago, he was quite satisfied that Dr. Carroll, when settling the plans of the Cathedral, was guided by memories of the shrine where he received the Episcopal character.

The corner-stone of the chapel was laid by Thomas Weld, the pious and munificent master of Lulworth Castle, on Candlemas-Day, 1786. Under the stone was placed a brass plate bearing a Latin inscription, composed by Father Giovenazzi, S.J., the then librarian of the Altieri Palace. There is a family tradition, somewhat obscure, however, that the founder of the chapel was also its architect. His portrait at Lulworth, which represents him holding the plans of the building in his hand, would seem to confirm the tradition. But this, our informant adds, is uncertain. In its day St. Mary's, Lulworth, was, with perhaps a single exception, the finest place of Catholic worship in England.

Charles Walmesley, O.S.B., titular Bishop of Rama, and Vicar-Apostolic of the Western District, is the link which binds the

¹ King George III. twice visited the chapel. "I speak," said Dr. Milner, in one of the sermons he delivered at Lulworth, "within walls, equally known to and equally honored by Pius VI. and George III."

Church of the United States to the Church of St. Austin and St. Gregory. He edified his contemporaries by his holy life. His memory was long held in benediction by those who were witnesses of his zeal and virtue. Moreover, he was celebrated throughout Europe for his literary and scientific performances. To-day, his career, both as scientist and priest, is quite unknown. Even Father Brennan makes no mention of him in his valuable book, *What Catholics have done for Science*.

Some fifty years since, the publisher of the second American edition of Dr. Walmesley's *History of the Church* undertook to supply a biographical sketch of the venerable author. But, despite solicitous inquiries, he was able to collect only a few facts of interest relating to him. The compiler of the present sketch, while perhaps more successful, has experienced no less difficulty than did the editor of 1834, for the Bishop's life was quite uneventful. "His firmness in resisting innovation, his ability and integrity, his unremitting attention to official duties," entitled his memory to the grateful respect and admiration of those who knew him. But his work was mainly diocesan or parochial. The bulk of his correspondence relates to such matters, in which there is little to interest the ordinary reader. In Rome one would hope to find generous materials. But in the Propaganda Archives only two of Dr. Walmesley's communications are to be found. Both are holographs, are written in large, clear, masculine characters, and are signed "Charles Evêque de Rama." All that can be gleaned from the records of the English College is briefly this: He was consecrated in the Sodality chapel there in December, 1756, and was for many years Vicar-Apostolic of Western England.

He was born of ancient and pious stock at Westwood House, Lancashire, England, January 13th, 1722. Two of his brothers became priests of the Society of Jesus. He received his early education in the Anglo-Benedictine College of St. Edmund's, Rue St. Jacques, Paris. Here, at the age of seventeen, he, after one year's novitiate, was professed a monk of the order of St. Benedict. He was ordained in Paris, but just when, we have not been able to learn.

Ten years after his profession he was chosen Prior of St. Edmund's. After completing his quadrennium, he was summoned to Rome as Procurator of his order. Meanwhile he began to be known by reason of his singular ability in mathematics. In 1748, the year preceding his election to the priorate, he had won the applause of the French savants by his essay, *La Théorie du Mouvement des Comètes*. Together with this was published his commentary on Robert Cotes's *Harmonia*, an important contribution to the early stages of Calculus. In the following year he published, also at

Paris, *La Théorie du Mouvement des Apsides*. He was chosen Fellow of the Royal Society of Great Britain, November 1st, 1750, on the recommendation of such men as Buffon, Jussieu and D'Alembert. His certificate calls him a gentleman of very distinguished merit and learning. When the "Act for regulating the commencement of the year and for correcting the calendar now in use" was being drafted, Père Walmesley's assistance was sought by the Government, at the suggestion of the Royal Society, backed by the personal influence of the president thereof, Lord Macclesfield. But no mention of the monk's share in the change of style was made in the prints of that day. The change from the Julian to the Gregorian calendar shocked the civic and religious prejudices of the English, and the fact that a priest had anything to do with the Act would, if divulged, have rendered its passage more odious than it really was. In 1755 Père Walmesley made his first contribution to the memoirs of the Royal Academy of Berlin, of which, as well as of the Institute of Bologna, he had, meanwhile, been made a member. He had now achieved a continental reputation as a man of science. But his scientific pursuits did not detract from the regular and edifying performance of his duties as priest and religious.

In the spring of 1756, in his thirty-fifth year, he was elevated to the episcopal dignity. The venerable Bishop York, needing a coadjutor, specially desired Père Walmesley's appointment, he being "perfectly sound in body, and of pleasing and captivating manners." On the 6th of July following, Cardinal Spinelli, Prefect of Propaganda, wrote thus from Parma to the President-General of the Benedictines:

"The election of Father Walmesley as coadjutor to Bishop York is no less an acknowledgment of his merit than a mark of the esteem in which your congregation is held. For myself, I am happy to have contributed towards it, and I do not doubt that the new prelate will equal the expectations that have been formed of his wisdom and virtue."

The "new prelate" was consecrated in Rome, December 21st, 1756, by Cardinal Marcello Federigo Lante, the same, be it said, who gave episcopal consecration to Clement XIV. after his election to the Pontificate. In the following year Bishop Walmesley took up his residence at Bath with the Benedictine missionary who served the faithful in that city. In 1764, on the retirement of Bishop York, he became Vicar-Apostolic of the West. In 1780, during the riots at Bath, the new mission-chapel, the presbytery, the registers of the mission, the diocesan archives, the Bishop's

library and some valuable manuscripts were utterly destroyed.¹ It is consoling to know that the leader in this disgraceful affair was, presently, capitally tried, condemned and hanged.

In 1787 Dr. Walmesley took a house of his own at Bath, where he resided till his death.

At the outset of his episcopal career his duties, as coadjutor, did not withdraw the Bishop from his beloved mathematics. The learned author of the *Historical Memoirs of English Catholics*, etc., is mistaken when he says that at, or soon after, his elevation to the episcopate, Dr. Walmesley gave up entirely his scientific researches. But Mr. Butler speaks to the purpose when he reproaches the English Benedictines that they have not given to the world an account of the prelate's attainments. Such men as Sir John Leslie, Professor Playfair, of Edinburgh, and the late Professor Augustus DeMorgan have written of him in terms of admiration. And Bailly, the celebrated astronomer-mayor of Paris, speaks repeatedly and appreciatively of his brother-savant, Père Walmesley, in his *Histoire de l'Astronomie Moderne* (Paris, 1787).

In 1758 the Bishop made his second contribution to the memoirs of the Berlin Academy—a treatise *De la Méthode des Différences et la Sommation des Séries*.

It will appear, on a careful examination of the *Philosophical Transactions*, that Mr. Charles Walmesley, F.R.S., sent in but four papers during his forty-seven years of membership in the Royal Society. It will, furthermore, appear that Brady, Oliver and M. Le Glay are mistaken when they say that some of his astronomical papers were inserted in the *Philosophical Transactions* of 1745 and the two succeeding years. Of the four papers just alluded to, the first two were sent from Rome to the Astronomer-Royal about a month before their author's consecration. Both are written in Latin, are illustrated by complicated diagrams, and together occupy fifty-three pages quarto; one is entitled, "Essay on the Precession of the Equinoxes and the Mutation of the Earth's Axis." The other is, "A Theory of the Irregularities that may be Occasioned in the Annual Movement of the Earth by the Action of Jupiter and Saturn." Accompanying them is an introductory letter in which the author explains his choice of the geometrical method of proof in preference to the method of Calculus. The third paper is in Latin, and was forwarded to the Astronomer-Royal from Bath, 1758. It is headed, "Of the Irregularities of a Satellite Arising from the Spheroidal Figure of its Primary

¹ It now appears that the mission library at Bath was not entirely destroyed in the fire of 1780. A number of books, formerly belonging to it, and having Bishop Walmesley's autograph on the fly-leaves, turned up lately in a bookseller's shop in London.

Planet." The Bishop apologized for the shortcomings of this paper on the ground of ill-health and press of business.

The fourth and last and most voluminous paper—it covers fifty-seven pages, quarto—is a treatise "On the Irregularities in the Planetary Motions Caused by the Mutual Attraction of the Planets." Like the other three, it is written in Latin. It was dispatched from Bath to Dr. Morton, Secretary of the Royal Society, on November 21st, 1761.

Some time after this date, we know not when, Dr. Walmesley renounced the study of mathematics. The following occurrence is said to have occasioned the renunciation. One day, while at the altar, he found himself so absorbed in the consideration of a problem that had suggested itself to him as to be tracing diagrams on the sacred linens with the paten. In deep contrition he at once forswore science. Thenceforward he gave himself to studies purely ecclesiastical, especially to the interpretation of Scripture. The first fruit of his new investigations was his *History of the Church*, published in 1771, under the pseudonym of "Signor Pastorini." It is an elucidation of the Apocalypse. It proceeds upon the theory that that mysterious book is a summary of the Divine economy regarding the Church from her foundation to her final triumphant estate in Heaven. The work was, in its day, very popular, and is still in demand. An American edition was issued as early as 1807.

According to M. Le Glay, "Correspondant de l'Institut" at Douai, the *History* won for its author from the Faculty of Paris the rank and privileges of a Doctor of the Sorbonne. Maziere Brady seems to think that Bishop Walmesley possessed this distinction before his elevation to the episcopate. But Le Glay says that he gathered the facts contained in his sketch from the monks of St. Gregory at Douai, and from unpublished letters. "Pastorini" was translated into Latin, French, Italian and German. Nay, two German versions were made. But only Father Goldhagen's was printed. The history of the other is interesting.

In 1778 Maur Heatley, Abbot of Lambspring, wrote as follows to the Prior of St. Edmund's at Paris:

"Some time ago I translated "Pastorini" into High German; but our bishop would not allow it to be printed in this diocese (Hildesheim). He objected much to the liberties taken by the author in his arbitrary explanations of the Apocalypse and ancient prophets, and desired me to have no hand in the printing of it. Wherefore, in my opinion, it would be more advisable and answer all purposes to have it printed at Strasburg, whence it would go through the whole empire by the different booksellers at Mayence, Frankfort, Bamberg, etc.; if I can promote the affair with prudence I shall be ever ready to serve you or Mr. Walmesley."

Abbé Feller thought better of "Pastorini" than did the Bishop of Hildesheim. Writing in 1786, he declares that the book is the only good comment on the Apocalypse that England had till then produced. He calls it a learned and edifying performance, and says that the English nation is indebted to the author for his part in putting down the theories of King James and Newton. Learned and edifying the book unquestionably is. It was used by the missionaries in this country more than a century ago with happiest results. Still we cannot help thinking that "Signor Pastorini" is now and then sufficiently extravagant. His book occasioned a curious bit of Irish history. Dr. Doyle, the celebrated Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, had, after strenuous efforts, almost succeeded in extirpating Ribbonism from his diocese. But in 1822 a new edition of "Pastorini" was published in Dublin. Somebody called the attention of the Ribbon leaders to an obscure prediction, or rather calculation, contained in the ninth chapter, to the effect that the fifth vial of Divine wrath was soon to be poured out upon the Protestant world. The report was industriously circulated, and the lodges began to revive in consequence. So great did the evil become that "J. K. L." judged it necessary to rebuke the popular credulity in his celebrated Pastoral of 1822 against the Ribbonmen.

In 1778 *Ezekiel's Vision Explained* was brought out. Writing on March 18th of that year, the Bishop says:

"I am just now publishing a small performance, viz., an explanation of the first chapters of the prophecy of Ezekiel. It has cost me a good deal of meditation and pains at different times, for it has been for some few years past the subject of my thoughts. As to the merit of it, I leave it to take its chances." In October of the same year he writes: "Critics may make whatever objection they choose to my books, and welcome. But I shall not take it upon myself to answer them. The task would be endless. I shall leave my works to take care of themselves."

Almost the only trying episode in the Bishop's life was the contest which, with his brother vicars, he waged against the Catholic Committee. His conduct in that unfortunate business was such as to merit for him the title of "The Athanasius of the English Catholic Church."

In 1783 five laymen, without commission from any one, constituted themselves a committee to manage the affairs of the Catholics of England. Their purpose was to effect the civil and religious emancipation of their co-religionists, and, in particular, to do away with the then existing system of Church government by vicars-apostolic. The vain and presumptuous Charles Butler, of Lincoln's Inn, was the secretary of this junta. Beyond publishing their programme, the gentlemen of the committee did nothing for four years. At the end of that time they issued a circular let-

ter to their Catholic countrymen containing some remarks little short of schismatical anent the institution of the vicars-apostolic. The laity looked with distrust upon the proceedings of the organization, seeing that the clergy were excluded from its deliberations. To remove this impression, two bishops, the vicar-apostolic of the London District and the coadjutor of the Midland District, were, together with the Rev. Joseph Wilks, the Benedictine missionary at Bath, invited to membership by the committee. The first mentioned prelate afterwards said that he joined to act as a check upon their doings.

In order to prepare the mind of the British public against their intended application to Parliament, the gentlemen of the Committee laid before the Catholics of England for their signatures the so-called "Protestation and Declaration"—a solemn disclaimer of principles vulgarly supposed to be part of the faith of Catholics. This instrument, which purported to be drawn up by a Protestant nobleman, was full of errors, grammatical, logical, and theological. The four vicars at first refused to sign it; but they finally consented to do so after certain modifications had been made. Bishop Walmesley subsequently withdrew his signature, complaining that he had been tricked into subscribing. In round numbers only about 1600 Catholics signed the "Protestation."

At the suggestion of Protestant friends, the Committee now proceeded to transform the "Protestation" into a "Protestation Oath" to be incorporated in the Bill of Relief which they were to introduce into Parliament. The "Oath" had all the errors of the original "Protestation," and others beside. To subscribe to this document was bad enough, but the "Oath" was too much for the consciences of the faithful. To make matters worse, the Bill of Relief was so worded as to benefit only such Catholics as would in a court of justice declare themselves "Protesting Catholic Dissenters." The Vicars-Apostolic, though ostentatiously ignored by the Committee, were watching closely all these strange proceedings. They now judged it time to speak out. At Bishop Walmesley's invitation they met in synod at Hammersmith. An Encyclical Letter condemning the Oath was the result of their deliberations. In his own—the Western—District Bishop Walmesley followed up the Encyclical with a Pastoral explanatory of its provisions. Joseph Wilks, the missionary at Bath, already mentioned as a member of the Committee, not only refused to read the letters to his flock, but spoke publicly against the synod. Showing himself deaf to all expostulation, he was suspended by Bishop Walmesley in the following terms:

"As you have evidently refused submission to the ordinances of the Apostolic Vicars, if before or on Sunday next, the 26th instant, you do not make to me satisfactory submission, I declare

you suspended from the exercise of all missionary faculties and ecclesiastical functions in my district.

"Let this one admonition suffice for all. Carolus Ramaten., Vicar-Apostolic."

After a few months of contumacy Wilks submitted, and was restored. But having written a letter explaining away his submission, he was soon deprived of his faculties for a second time. Dr. Walmesley's action in this matter occasioned, on the part of Wilks's friends, a tremendous uproar, the echoes whereof did not die out for several years. Prominent gentlemen and ladies strove in vain to induce the Bishop to reverse his sentence. Whereupon certain priests, known as the Staffordshire clergy, bound themselves to make the suspended priest's quarrel their own. But all such interference failed of its purpose. For Dr. Walmesley's conduct was applauded by the other vicars and by the Holy See.

Not many months after the issue of the first Encyclical, two of the vicars concerned in its issue died. Butler and his associates schemed vigorously to secure the appointment of friends of the Committee to the vacant positions. The lengths to which they went, or proposed to go, are astonishing. But the Holy See rebuked their impertinence by appointing Drs. Gibson and Douglas: which action nearly caused a schism. Thomas Weld invited the new prelates to come and be consecrated at Lulworth. And there, December 5, 1790, Bishop Walmesley gave consecration to Dr. Gibson, who two weeks later performed the same solemn service for Dr. Douglas.

The Committee being still defiant, Dr. Walmesley and the two new vicars prepared, before leaving Lulworth, a fresh condemnation of the "Oath." But before publishing it they made a last and vain attempt at pacification. The new Encyclical was answered with a scandalous, nay, blasphemous "Protest." Then the Bishops resolved to fight the Bill in Parliament. Dr. Milner was deputed to make interest with the members. So well did he succeed that when the Bill was brought in, decisive action was postponed on the ground that it did not voice the sentiments of the Catholic body. The Government chose to hearken to the conscientious voice of the Vicars-Apostolic rather than to the clamors of the Committee. Nor was the Bill passed till the obnoxious neologism, "Protesting Catholic Dissenters," had been withdrawn, and the still more obnoxious "Oath" discarded. During this long struggle the old Bishop used to say: "I have asked my Master that this bad Oath may not pass, and He will hear my prayers." That the Catholics of England have kept their old and honorable designation before the law, is due beyond any one else to Bishop Charles Walmesley. He did not live to see the end of the troubles of the Church in England. The system of lay interference in the ecclesiastical affairs of the English Catholics, inaugurated by Butler and

his friends in 1783, was for almost forty years afterward a source of disorders, divisions, and irreligion.

Bishop Walmesley closed his long and well-spent life by a happy exit at Bath on the 25th of November, 1797, in the 75th year of his age and the fortieth of his episcopacy. He was buried in St. Joseph's Chapel at Bristol. The beautiful Latin epitaph which records his virtues and his scientific eminence was written by his friend, Father Charles Plowden.

Bishop Walmesley was a man of very severe character. He was the last of the Vicars-Apostolic in England to allow his diocesans the use of flesh meat in Lent. He was much given to meditation on the four last things; and in the company of his friends was wont to repeat the grim warning, "Adesse, festinant tempora." In his dealings with those who sided with Wilks against him, he was perhaps unreasonably severe. One cannot help wondering what became of "the pleasing and captivating manners" that so favorably impressed old Bishop York. The following recital, drawn from a letter of Bishop James Talbot, will give a pretty fair idea of the repute enjoyed by Dr. Walmesley among his contemporaries.

In 1779, when he applied for a coadjutor, he presented to Propaganda the names of three Benedictines. The Roman authorities were displeased. So they wrote to the venerable Bishop Challoner and begged him to answer these three questions:

1. Does Dr. Walmesley really want a coadjutor?
2. What do you know about the gentlemen he has named?
3. Is there no secular priest fit for the position?

Dr. Challoner answered:

1. I do not think Dr. Walmesley really wants an assistant.
2. The three gentlemen are unknown to me and mine.
3. No secular could ever be agreeable to Dr. Walmesley, nor would any secular ever choose to be assistant to him. He concludes by suggesting that matters had better remain "in statu quo."

Dr. Walmesley, however, got his Benedictine assistant, whom he consecrated at Wardour Castle with a splendor of ceremonial never seen in England since the days of Philip and Mary.¹

A word or two about the priests whose names are appended to Bishop Carroll's certificate. They were all ex-Jesuits. Charles Plowden was the most distinguished of the quartette. He was born in 1743 of a good old English Catholic family, and entered the Jesuit novitiate at the age of sixteen. At the time of the suppression of his order he was imprisoned for about six months in

¹ The engraving of Bishop Walmesley which serves as the frontispiece of the American edition of "Pastorini" is, in the estimation of those who have seen the authentic portrait at Downside, but a poor likeness. The Downside portrait represents him in the habit of his order and without episcopal insignia.

Belgium. In 1784 he settled at Lulworth Castle as tutor to the sons of Mr. Weld. Ten years later he went to Stonyhurst, which was his home for twenty-three years. In 1817 he was chosen Provincial of his English brethren. He died in France, June, 1821, while on his way from Rome to England. He was buried in the parish where he died, strange to say, with the military honors due to a French general.

He was a universal scholar, and especially admired for his literary ability. Let any one who doubts this read his address at Dr. Carroll's consecration. Eight of his published works are mentioned in the "*Collectanea S. J.*" One of them, a pamphlet on the Papal Infallibility, is considered by Hürter to entitle him to a place among the theologians who have deserved well of the Church since the Council of Trent. A letter to Dr. Carroll, wherein he states his intention of writing that pamphlet and narrating the events leading to it, is to be seen in the archives of the See of Baltimore. "Indeed," says Dr. Oliver after summing up Father Plowden's literary labors, "his pen was never idle." It was he, by the way, who induced Bishop Walmesley to convoke the synod which condemned the "Protestation Oath," who was that prelate's ablest ally in the long and bitter contest with the Committee, and it was he who prevailed upon Thomas Weld to throw open his castle and chapel for the consecration of Bishops Gibson and Douglas.

Father James Porter, the other priest assistant, was born in the Low Countries, of English parents, in 1733. He entered the Society in 1752, and eighteen years later became one of the professed Fathers. Renouncing a considerable estate, he led for many years the life of a poor missionary in Wiltshire, England. He died in 1810.

Father Charles Forrester, alias Fleury, was a Frenchman. He lived at Wardour Castle as missionary and chaplain from 1775 to 1810. He was an able, zealous, and amiable priest. When the Society was restored, he reunited himself to it. He died in 1825.

Thomas Stanley had been for many years previous to Dr. Carroll's consecration one of the household at Lulworth. He went to live there shortly after the marriage of his niece to Thomas Weld. He was born in 1715, and became a novice in 1732. He died at the castle, full of years and merits, in 1805.¹

¹ The writer wishes here to tender his grateful acknowledgments to all who have helped him in the preparation of this paper, but especially to His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons; the Gustavo Conrado, Rector of Propaganda; to Dom Gilbert Dolan, O. S. B., of St. Gregory's, Downside, Bath; to Father Reginald Colley, S. J., Rector of Stonyhurst; to Father Lennon, President of St. Cuthbert's, Ushaw, Durham; to Father Caswell, Librarian at Oscott; to Miss Agnes F. Weld, of Lulworth Castle; to Joseph Gillow, Esq., of Bowdon, Cheshire, author of the "*Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics*," and lastly but most cordially to his old friend of "*The Mountain*," Mr. Haldeman O'Connor, who has rendered invaluable service by his researches in the British Museum Library.

THE LAST FOUR YEARS IN BELGIUM.

THE lover of liberty turns his eyes hopefully to Belgium, where a brave struggle for the rights of the people, home rule, tolerance, order and religion has been rewarded with a memorable victory. As the latest developments of this struggle bring out clearly the real position of the opposing social and political forces of our day, a summary of more recent Belgian history has an especial interest and value. The facts tell more than one practical lesson.

Belgium won her independence in 1830. During the fifty-eight years that have since gone by, the Government has been almost continuously in the hands of a so-called Liberal party. The Conservatives held office from 1846 to 1847; from 1854 to 1857; and again from 1870 to 1878. Carried once more into power by a great popular wave in 1884, they still control the Government by a majority, both in the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, so large as to make their position secure for many a day. From 1830 to 1846 there was little of party feeling in Belgium. Above all there was no organized anti-religious party. A liberal constitution guaranteed every citizen the largest freedom of thought, speech and action. In the hands of right-minded, patriotic, liberal, progressive, far-seeing men, Belgium would long ago have been raised high above the nations as an exemplar of true liberty. But personal ambitions, the influence of revolutionary ideas and of the modern spirit of irreligion, the growth of a bad kind of Masonry, directed by men who accepted the radical teachings of the Italian, German and French lodges, in time divided the people, put the majority on the defensive, weakened the country, and forced it out of the way of true progress. In 1846 there was already an opposition party which, liberal in fact, was, for the sake of distinction from the ministerial party, Conservative in name, and Catholic. The ministerial party had dubbed itself "Liberal," but was Radical; and that word meant then, as nowadays it means, anti-Catholic, if not anti-Christian. Partly on account of a want of unity, due to the mistaken importance given to certain questions that were assumed to involve Catholic principles; partly on account of a lack of thorough organization, and an abundance of the spirit of *laissez faire* that has long gone by the name of "patience" among Catholics in all countries; partly through a misapprehension of the

real purposes and the audacity of those who masqueraded under the name of Liberals ; and, more than all, on account of the conscienceless, lawless, revolutionary methods which the Radicals made use of, the Conservative-Catholic party, which really represented the country, was, as we have seen, almost continuously in a minority in the two Chambers. Up to the present day the Government has been under their control for but sixteen years out of the whole fifty-eight of Belgian autonomy.

As must invariably happen where the principles of a party are not based on religion, the tendency of the so-called Liberal party was steadily in the direction of greater and greater Radicalism. Power was by degrees more and more centred in the State. The liberties of the Provinces and the Communes were violated, abrogated. Catholics were hampered, deprived of constitutional rights, and, indeed, denounced as unworthy of any freedom other than that which it might please their open enemies to concede them. The finances of the country were mismanaged, and the debt and taxes increased without any satisfactory return to the people. Worse than all, a propaganda, not of philosophical infidelity, but of forceful, riotous, anarchic irreligion, fostered by the very Ministers themselves, was actively at work among the people. The necessities of ministry after ministry compelled them to sacrifice the views of moderate men to the demands of the narrow-minded, the bitter, the blindly unpatriotic Radical wing of the party. Finally, in 1879, Frère-Orban's School Law was passed, and a rude blow given to the liberties of the individual and the Commune. The education of the people was put under the absolute rule of the State ; and a compulsory system of irreligious teaching was forced upon the citizens, on the ground that the Ten Commandments of God and the laws of the Church nullified conscience.

Of the bold, manly, intelligent and successful opposition made to this illiberal law, we gave some account in the pages of this REVIEW several years ago.¹ The people, awakened from their sleep, organized themselves in defence of the liberties guaranteed them by the Constitution, of their natural rights, of the Christian religion. On the other hand, the Radicals who had forced the Government into the ways of tyranny were more than ever audacious in their methods and exacting in their demands. They did not realize the temper of the people. But when the people were ready they made clear their purpose to be rid of the men who would have put them under the rule of a despotism. At the elections of May and June, 1884, the Conservative-Catholics, supported by

¹ "The School Question in Belgium."—CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1885.

all the liberty lovers of the country, were carried into office with the remarkable majorities of 34 in the Chamber of Deputies and of 17 in the Senate. Before the elections they were in the minority by 20 votes in the Chamber and 5 in the Senate. This peaceful revolution has only gathered strength with time. The elections of 1886 gave the Conservative-Catholic party a majority of 56 in the Chamber of Deputies and an increased majority in the Senate. No ministry had ever come before the Chambers with a like majority to back it. The events of the two following years only served to fix the people's confidence in a Conservative-Catholic ministry. Witness the elections of 1888, when the majority in the Chamber of Deputies was increased to 58, and that in the Senate to 33. And yet, if you remember, in 1884 the American journals were informing us that the "Clericals" were treading on dangerous ground, and that their opposition to Radical centralization was "iniquitous and inexcusable!"

The ministry which came into office under Malou, in June, 1884, was not slow in giving back to the country the liberties which had been temporarily filched from it. Within six weeks a new School Bill, that recognized and guarded the natural rights of the parent, the constitutional liberties of the Communes, and the rights of minorities, was presented to both Houses. A month later the bill was passed and received the King's signature. The attempt of the Radicals to intimidate the Ministry, the Chambers, and the King, by mobs, riots and bloodshed, came to nought. The Ministry maintained the peace by firm, moderate measures. When the King, listening to the suggestions of one of the most radical of the ex-ministers, Bara, tried to force a compromise ministry on Malou, after the elections in the autumn of 1884, the Ministry rejected the proposal as a unit. When he requested the resignation of MM. Jacobs and Woeste, who had been active in drawing up and passing the new School Law, they declined to resign unless under the exercise of the King's prerogative; and as the King unreasonably exercised his prerogative, Malou resigned, saying to the King that, after fighting for the crown and the country against "Liberalism" and Radicalism for forty years, he was unwilling to seem to accept the King's line of conduct. Bernaert, who is still Premier, took Malou's place, and brought into his Cabinet M. Thonissen, the well-known Professor of Law at Louvain, and Caraman-Chimay, who had served of old under Conservative governments.

The Radicals who called themselves Liberals, as well as those who, scouting the name Liberal, would be known only as Radicals, were not satisfied with the turn of affairs. They hoped that force would have helped them to save some of their bad work. But they counted without their host. The Conservative-Catholics

had given way to force, years before, in the interest of what was called the peace of the country. Now they had determined that there should be peace, not at the expense of the peaceful citizens, but rather at the expense of the law-breakers and revolutionaries. On the 18th of November, 1884, Frère-Orban, who could not hide his fears and his spite, asked the new Ministry whether the recent changes meant only changes of persons, or a real change of policy. And Bernaert seized the occasion to make his position clear before the country. The changes in the Ministry were, he said, due to the exercise of the royal prerogative; on questions of principle, the present Ministry had the same convictions as the former Ministry. The frankness and courage of this answer, with its direct defence of parliamentary government against the uncalled for interference of royalty, and its clear announcement of a definite policy in accordance with the wishes of the people as expressed in the election, had a far reaching effect. The Radical-Liberals called off their professional agitators and rioters; and the Government proceeded, with no uncertain hand, to put into execution the new School Law. Discussing this law, in 1885, we qualified it as "a just law," "a law of statesmen," a law "devised to meet existing conditions," a law "assuring freedom of instruction and protecting the rights of the minority." The eagerness with which the Communes availed themselves of its liberal provisions, and their satisfaction with its working, as shown by the popular vote at every election since its passage, testify to the correctness of our appreciation of the Malou School Law. No better evidence could be offered of the soundness of the Ministry's position and the malice of the riotous opposition to the law than that given by the action of the Radical-Liberals within a few weeks after Bernaert's manly speech.

A certain M. Buis, Burgomaster of Brussels, a forward Radical, and, of course, a forward Mason, founder of the political club called the "Educational League," had used his position to encourage the agitation against the School Law, the Ministry and the King. He it was who gave preference and precedence to the Radical demonstration against the bill; he it was who permitted the mob to attack and maltreat the Conservative demonstration in favor of the bill, and for this he was publicly censured by the Senate; he it was who organized the extraordinary league of Radical burgomasters—these are not elective officers—who, in meeting assembled, swore a solemn oath to prevent the signing and execution of the new School Law, by every *legal* means; he it was who issued a manifesto as late as September 15th, advising the world that he, and the burgomasters allied with him, would *never* cease using the threatened legal means against the law. By the 5th of Decem-

ber the terrible burgomasters, who had sworn the mighty oath, had come to an agreement to *propose to their Communal Councils to place rooms at the disposal of the clergy, in which they might give religious instruction*, out of school hours. The Radical Communal Council at Ghent had eaten its leek a week earlier. How bold they were when in power, these men of compromise! When they were about to trample on the Constitution in 1879, Minister Von Humbeek voiced the views of all the roaring Bulls: "The teaching contained in the ten commandments of God, and in the laws of the Church, is the absolute negation of liberty of conscience, the teaching of a sect; on this account, from this time forward, this teaching would not be put before the pupils by the teacher; it would be excluded from elementary education." And here, alas! we find M. Van Humbeek *excluded* from the Government, and the Radicals violating whatever conscience they have, in order to accommodate the clergy who may wish to instruct the pupils how to "negate" liberty of conscience, after school hours! What a fine teacher adversity is!

The Frère-Orban Ministry used the unpopular School Law to serve purposes not disclosed in the bill. Belgium had continuously held diplomatic relations with the Papacy. Failing to obtain the Pope's aid in the Radical attack on the Church, Frère-Orban had contemptuously withdrawn the Belgian representative at the Vatican. In answer to an interpellation from the Conservatives on April 23d, 1884, about six weeks before the defeat of the Radicals at the polls, the Minister of Foreign Affairs declared that a renewal of diplomatic relations with the Papal See was impossible. Within three months from this date, on July 18th, Malou telegraphed to Rome, proposing a renewal of diplomatic relations. On the 8th of August both houses passed a bill to that effect, and appropriated monies to meet the expenses of the mission. Meantime Malou resigned. Under Bernaert the negotiations were completed, and on March 30th, 1885, the Pope nominated the President of the Ecclesiastical Academy, Monsignor Domenico Ferrata, as Nuncio to Belgium. Within eleven months after coming into office the Conservatives had performed the "impossible!"

But they had then done, and they have since done, many things possible and desirable. When the Conservative Catholic Ministry resigned in 1878, after eight years of rule, it left a well-filled treasury. The receipts exceeded the expenses by some \$7,000,000. Evidently the Radicals looked upon a moderate surplus as a national evil. Within five years they had not only made away with the surplus, but had issued new loans to the amount of \$80,000,000, laid more than \$5,000,000 of new taxes on the people, and accumulated a deficit of \$13,000,000. The Conservative-

Catholics were quick to find a remedy against this comprehensive system of waste. Shortly before their defeat, on March 4th, the Radicals had presented the budget for 1885, showing a modest deficit of \$700,000. The Bernaert Ministry brought in a new budget, based on other notions of official responsibility and public economy. As a result, the proposed deficit was turned into a surplus of \$400,000. The budget of 1886 showed a surplus of \$535,000; that of 1887 a surplus of \$2,400,000. Meantime, the annual expenditures had been steadily reduced, and, in 1887, were \$3,000,000 less than in 1884. The Radical love of liberty is too often apparent only in a free handling of the public purse. Under the management of the Conservative-Catholics Belgian credit was so strengthened that, in August, 1885, the Ministry announced its intention of refunding the national debt, which carried 4 per cent., into a $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. obligation, and this operation has since been effected, with a saving of somewhat over \$1,000,000 a year. To us who saddled ourselves joyfully with a debt of a couple of milliards—partly that we might know what it was to be blessed—and who think nothing of paying off \$20,000,000 of bonds in a week, these little savings may seem hardly worth reckoning. But with the crowded and poorly paid population of Belgium every little counts. Every little counts here, if we only realized it; and, in good time, we shall certainly have to learn the lesson that the rest of the world was forced to learn long ago. In Belgium strict economy is absolutely necessary. Were there no such thing as patriotism, or justice, or common humanity, the law of self-preservation would compel sane men to keep down the expenditure to the lowest point possible. The country is the most densely inhabited in Europe. When the first census of the new kingdom was taken in 1831, the population numbered 3,785,814. Since that date there has been a considerable Belgian emigration, and yet on the 31st of December, 1885, there was a population of 5,853,278. The rate of increase has been steadily higher than in any other European country. With this notable and regular growth of the population, and the declining prices for coal, iron, grain and cattle, true politicians find themselves facing a problem which is to be solved only by the greatest prudence.

Having in part undone the work of centralization which the Radical Liberals had so boisterously pushed along, and having lightened the burdens of all classes, the Ministry next sought the best means to give the people a larger voice in their own government. The policy of the Conservative-Catholics may be summed up in two words: Home Rule and Popular Representation. One would imagine they were liberals! Strange to say, during the whole time the Radical Liberals held office, they were uniformly opposed to

any extension of the franchise. Nowadays, when universal suffrage is assumed to be a cure for all political and social ills, we expect a Liberal to be somewhat radical on the question of manhood suffrage. But the Belgian Radical Liberals were more than conservative on this subject. Up to 1885 there were only twenty voters to the thousand in Belgium. Of the total male adult population, one-thirteenth enjoyed the franchise. The exclusion of so large a proportion of the citizens from the right to vote was due, in part, to the Constitution, and, in part, to the system of taxation that had been long in vogue. There are three classes of voters in Belgium. Any citizen, paying taxes yearly to the amount of ten francs, may vote for members of the Communal Councils. These Councils control the police, the public works, and the public institutions of their respective Communes, and from among the members of these Councils the King selected the burgomaster, or mayor, and certain others to perform the duties of Aldermen. In order to vote for members of the Provincial Councils that exercise general powers over the nine provinces into which Belgium is divided, the citizen must pay taxes yearly to the amount of twenty francs. When it comes to voting for parliamentary representatives, the Constitution is much more exacting. Only those can vote who pay a yearly tax of forty-two francs thirty-five centimes. This requirement of the Constitution threw the control of the general government into the hands of a body of citizens relatively much smaller in number than that which directed the affairs of the provinces and communes. Any lowering of the constitutional limit of taxation, or alteration in the tax laws, would have increased the vote of the farmers. There are fully 800,000 Belgians directly engaged in agricultural pursuits. As skilful tillers of the land, and breeders of cattle, they are known the world over. The rare rate of increase in population is a proof of their morality, and the credit of the country testifies to their industry and frugality. The Radical Liberals feared the free expression of the farmers' vote. The party was not merely opposed to extending the franchise, but it sought to nullify the influence of the agricultural vote in the Provincial and Communal Councils, where it was more general by reason of the more moderate requirements of the laws on taxation and representation. To make this vote unavailing, to deprive it of its rightful voice in local affairs, the Radicals tried to wrench from province and commune their constitutional and traditional rights, and to centre them in the hands of the general government, the least representative body in the kingdom. Was this policy based on an ardent love of liberty? No, but on a love of power and a narrow spirit of illiberal, tyrannical intolerance. The farming class is not irreligious, and it is conservative, orderly, Catholic.

The Frère-Orban ministry was opposed to any extension of the franchise; the Radical doctrinaires, philosophers and press were opposed to the extension of the franchise, and, of course, the Belgian lodges would have none of it. Universal suffrage would have fixed the Catholics in power for an indefinite period. But the Catholics had no desire to force the question. In the actual position of parties nothing could be done. To have manhood suffrage the Constitution would have to be revised. A revision of the Constitution can be effected only by a vote of both houses, dissolution, a new election and an adoption of proposed amendments by a two-thirds vote in the house and the senate. As parties stood, the Conservatives could do nothing to bring on universal suffrage. Nor, indeed, could the Radical Liberals. However, they could have widened the suffrage without a revision, had they not feared the consequences. Towards the end of its last lease of power, the party found itself in straits. The Radicals of a few years back had been distanced by a new set of Radicals. These were republican, socialistic, anarchist. They wanted universal suffrage, because they could not get it. Their purpose was one of agitation, disturbance, revolution. To give way to them, meant the destruction of the so-called Liberal party, the overturning of the Ministry, and a new order of things. But the case was desperate. Even were the party united, it was plain that the people were aroused, and meant to bury the Radical Liberals deep down under their own folly. The Ministry conceived a specious scheme, by which they hoped to pacify the real Radicals, to blind the friends of liberty, and to create a fictitious Radical Liberal majority. As it happened, they only dug a deeper pit for themselves. Frère-Orban brought in a law extending the franchise. This law gave a vote to certain classes of employees and officials, regardless of the payment of taxes; and, further, made a distinctive class of non-taxpaying voters out of those who should receive a diploma after a government examination—a sort of “civil service” voting class. This scientific extension of the franchise was skilfully qualified by regulations forbidding non-commissioned officers and soldiers to vote, while serving with the colors, and providing that the clergy should vote *at the places where they lived before entering the ministry*. The purpose of this bill is evident. It was not meant to enlarge the franchise; but it was meant to increase the Radical-Liberal vote and to diminish that of the Conservatives. This piece of pettifogging politics did not work as expected. After all, a man may have a diploma, and, at the same time, a sense of honor, justice and patriotism. So the event proved.

In January, 1885, the Bernaert Ministry gave notice of their intention to introduce a bill extending the franchise. They kept

their word ; and since that date they have not only taken care that the Senate and Chamber of Deputies shall more truly represent the people, but they have divested the Crown, or the Ministry, of certain rights heretofore exercised by one or the other, to the exclusion of the Provincial or Communal Councils. Nowhere has the principle of "home rule" received a heartier acknowledgment than in Belgium under a Catholic-Conservative government.

They have no income tax in Belgium. Hence the status of the parliamentary elector, paying 42 fr. 35 ct. per annum, depended on the legal methods of apportionment of several special taxes. Since, by the requirements of the Constitution, only those could vote who paid a definite sum of taxes, extension of the franchise was possible, at the moment, only through a redistribution of taxation. The position was a difficult one. Seldom does an occasion present itself when a class that escapes taxation is desirous of assuming a new share of the taxes. The country, however, appreciated the difficulty ; knew that the country alone was to blame for the actual state of things ; and was not only willing, but desirous, that the Ministry should enlarge the franchise by the best, and only practicable, means. To meet the wishes of the people, the Ministry, on July 10th, 1885, introduced a bill which placed the whole of the land tax on the tenants. This bill was passed on August 12th of the same year ; and Belgium took its first step forward in the path of popular representation. Hereafter, the son of the soil, the sturdy farmer, who pays a goodly share of taxes out of his hard earnings, will stand on a level with the townsman who pays no taxes, but, in lieu, patriotically bears the yoke of a government diploma.

The Machiavellian regulations of the Frère-Orban ministry, which practically disqualified military officers, clergymen, commercial travellers, boatmen, and other business men who had more than one residence, or place of business, were so modified as to assure the franchise to the honest voter. These democratic measures were hotly opposed by the Revolutionaries and the Radical Liberals. That the ministry would have gone much further in its acknowledgment of popular rights, were it not for the untoward events of 1886, is apparent from the bill adopted on November 24th, 1887, by which the right of appointment of the aldermen was taken away from the King, and put in the hands of the communal councils. The King still nominates the burgomasters, or mayors ; but, even so, the government of the Belgium communes approaches more nearly to the ideal of "home rule," is freer, more popular, more democratic-republican, than that of many of our American cities.

The open, fair, progressive temper of the Catholic-Conservative
VOL. XIV.—6

party is again emphasized by the bill introduced by the Bernaert ministry, on January 24th, 1888, a bill which the Chamber of Deputies forthwith resolved to take into consideration. This bill is in the interest of minorities, and, by a system of proportional representation, assures minorities a voice in public affairs. There is such a thing as *true* radicalism—a going to the root of things as they are. Compare it with that immoral, disorderly, indecent, blasphemous, contemporary thing called “Radicalism”; and then let all but knaves, fools, and madmen take their choice.

During its long years of rule, the Radical Liberal party, while showing a thorough contempt for the rights of the people, for liberal government, for progress, had endeavored to lower the moral standing of the townspeople, to divide class against class, to enforce the spread of ideas subversive of all law and all peace. It was with this object that they strove “to drive out the Catholic religion from elementary education.” But while the Catholic religion was the one they selected for their attacks, their real object was the total repression of all Christian teaching whatever. As one of their forward spokesmen announced, they wished “to secularize heaven as well as the earth”; “to do away with Christian spiritualism, the terrors of a future life, the pre-occupation with an imaginary salvation.” Unfortunately they succeeded to a certain extent, especially among the workingmen. When the Frère-Orban ministry was thrown out of power, it took the leaders some months to realize that their case was hopeless. Then the less radical element, or to put it more truly, the element that retained a longing for the offices, and was practical enough to know that these were not to be reached by the road of the Irreconcilables, undertook to reorganize the Radical Liberal party. Many who were ready to go to any length when in power, now pleaded for what they called moderation. But the true blue Radicals, under Janson, President of the Brussels Liberal Association, refused to give up an iota of their “principles.” The Radical Liberal party was split in twain; and split it is until this day. Negotiations begun from time to time, generally during the election campaigns, have all come to nothing. Recrimination has been the order of the day. Meantime Janson’s activity was not without effect. Around him he rallied a party made up of “secularized” democrats, who want a republic; of labor reformers, socialists, anarchists—*bonâ fidê* revolutionaries. Thanks to the good will, and the unremitting propaganda, of their French and German brothers, the Belgian workingmen, more especially the factory hands, miners, and workers in the large industrial establishments, have been won over to the worst forms of socialism. The army, too, has proved a good nursery for these pernicious teachings.

How wide an influence they had gained, how thoroughly a large body of poor men had been indoctrinated with the idea that force was a fair and serviceable means of attaining an end not bad in itself—and this they had been practically taught by the organized system of riots which the Radical Liberal party had used as a political means for nigh on to twenty years—how deeply the Radical Liberal press, and the un-Christian lodge and school, had undermined the public morals, was brought to light only in 1886.

The history of the greater part of that year is a painful record of riots, incendiarism, murder, ruthless destruction of private property, and forcible repression. Whatever reasonable occasion there may have been for local strikes, or whatever ills the workingmen of particular sections may have had just reason to complain of, there is strong evidence that the movement begun in Brussels on March 18th was a deliberate, organized movement, managed by the native and foreign socialist leaders. The 18th of March is the sad anniversary of the Paris Commune. On that day, at Brussels as well as at Liège, there was a commemorative demonstration of workingmen. The Brussels contingent paraded the streets, with banners, and flags, and noisy cries. Some shop windows were smashed; there were inflammatory speeches, of course; and there the matter ended. At Liège the celebration was of a heartier character. There the "workingmen" flung the red flag to the breeze, and encouraged peaceful citizens with shouts of "Down with Capital," "Death to the *Bourgeois*." The celebrants carried sticks, and, at a given signal they broke ranks, made their way into the shops, plundered right and left, and then took to wrecking. By the 21st the men in the collieries near Liège had begun to go out on strike. Bands of strikers robbed in broad daylight, and destroyed what they could not carry away. Meantime socialist meetings were held at Brussels, the men attending them being all armed with revolvers. By the 29th of the month there was a general strike throughout the whole district extending from Liège to Tournai, along the French border. The men in the coal mines and stone quarries, iron-workers, glass-workers, workers of all sorts, had laid down their tools, some willingly, some whether they would or not. From the revolutionary press they received every encouragement. The socialist leaders were active in direction. Placards were posted up recommending that the men should go armed to their public meetings. Liège, Namur, Charleroi, Mons, Tournai, were all centres of disturbance. The farmers were forced to pay cash indemnities to strikers; shops were sacked; blast furnaces extinguished; the great glassworks of the Hainault district pillaged and burned, one after the other. Country seats, châteaux, colleges, convents, were fired. There was a plentiful supply of petroleum

and beer. Axes, bludgeons, revolvers, were used effectively by the mob, and many lives were taken. Town upon town was in an actual state of siege.

The movement was wholly unexpected ; but the Government was prompt in taking measures to preserve the peace. It did not interfere, however, until events proved that neither police, gendarmes, nor civic guards, could deal with the rioters. On March 28th a state of siege was proclaimed throughout the districts covered by the strike, and general orders were given to fire without hesitation on all rioters. The army reserves of 1881, 1882, were called out, and the soldiery, under General Vander Smissen, took the strikers in hand. He adopted drastic measures. They were appreciated. By the 31st of the month work had been resumed at most of the collieries and factories ; and on the 7th of April the General was able to announce that order had been re-established. The strikes had not been settled. There was a constant force at work in the interest not of the workingmen, but of political agitation. New strikes were common, week after week, up to the 1st of September. One day the quarrymen struck at one place, returned to work in a week or two ; after a few days struck again. The next day it was the miners' turn. Sometimes the strikes were by districts ; then, at odd places wide apart.

A review of the political side of the strikes may prove interesting. No sooner had the celebration of the anniversary of the Paris Commune ended than the Radicals, Socialists, and Anarchists opened a sympathetic campaign. Brussels of course was the headquarters. There they held nightly meetings and processions. The King was loudly abused from the platform. A procession marched to the palace, to sing the Marseillaise under the King's windows. The strikers and rioters were applauded. Outside help was generous in its sacrifices. Foreign revolutionaries crowded into the capital. Early in the movement, Henri Rochefort, and Laguerre, the Paris Socialist Deputy, came to offer their services. But the Government was not sympathetic, and warned them to keep on their own side of the border. The Radical press directed and encouraged the rioters ; denounced the coal and mine operators, and the manufacturers, as men gorged with profits, and deservedly pillaged ; reproached the government for keeping the peace, and demanded that the state expropriate the present owners, intrust the working of the coal mines to syndicates of colliers, and introduce universal suffrage. Indeed the whole movement was, apparently, engineered with the idea of forcing universal suffrage by means of a reign of terror. On April 25th five hundred delegates, representing 104 societies, held a "Workmen's Congress," at Brussels. As a result of this meeting, the secretary of the

"Belgian Workingmen's Party" notified the Burgomaster of Brussels that the workingmen would make a demonstration in favor of universal suffrage, on June 13th, that they would to the number of from 80,000 to 100,000 parade through the streets of Brussels, and that, on behalf of the workingmen's party, he requested that the military should not be called upon to preserve order. M. Buis, the Burgomaster, who had, probably, learned by this time the risks of rioting, answered that under the circumstances he considered it his duty to forbid any public demonstration. The Government, on the 30th, gave notice that the procession would not be allowed. This was a costly set-back for the organizers of the demonstration, as money had been already distributed among the workingmen to encourage them to be present, and they had been furnished with pistols at the low price of two francs apiece. As the 13th of June approached rumors were rife in Brussels that the socialist leaders were preparing for a demonstration. The people took fright. Factories, banks, and shops were closed. But the alarm was false. The agitators were satisfied to show their power by inaugurating strikes, on that day, at Ghent, Charleroi, and Seraing. There the red flag was unfurled, amid cries of "*Vive la République.*" A congress of workingmen issued an address to the country, advising that the workingmen's party should contest all elections, and proposing a general strike, and they gave notice of a "monster" demonstration to be held on August 15th, the Belgian national feast-day. Should this be prohibited, they threatened a strike throughout the length and breadth of the country on the day following. The Congress adjourned on June 15th. Here are a few pearls that dropped from the mouth of the gentleman who made the closing speech. "To us belongs the State, with its laws and its powers. We will make of Belgium a *paradise*, and expel the priests, the exploiters, and everything else opprobrious and shameful." Evidently this thoroughgoing reformer had studied a Liberal Catechism, and thus failed to grasp the distinction between a paradise and a hell.

Finally, these good brothers passed a resolution recommending that the Socialists should boycott the *bourgeoisie*. On July 4th the workmen's party made public a second threat of a general strike should the demonstration of August 15th be interfered with. Meantime the Radicals, Socialists, and Anarchists fell to fighting. The Socialists repudiated the Radicals—place-hunters they called them—who had heretofore been the directing spirits. The Anarchists rejected both the other parties. Universal suffrage they pronounced mere flummery. The only cure for social evils, they asserted, was revolution, and then anarchy. At last the long talked of day arrived. The Government fixed the route of the proces-

sion; posted 600 police and gendarmes at fitting points; called out 6000 of the civic guard; put the garrison of 6000 men under arms, and garrisoned the neighboring towns. The promised 100,000 men numbered in fact only 15,000. They carried the red flag and the Phrygian cap instead of the national colors; shouted for Amnesty, the Republic, and Universal Suffrage, and then, no doubt, followed the needless suggestion of the organ of the Ghent Socialists, "to go to the public houses—there to discuss with the people on the premises the usefulness and necessity of universal suffrage." Certainly this "monster" demonstration was a poor return to the workingmen and the country for the seventy men who had been killed in the riots; for the losses in wages, the destruction of property, the increased local and general taxation. The glass industry was ruined, the communes were mulcted by the courts for extraordinary damages, the Government had to bring in a bill indemnifying private owners for grave losses. Prices rose, and the iron and coal interests lost their own market through the competition of the French and German mines. Numbers of natives and foreigners were jailed, indicted, tried, and condemned to lengthy terms of imprisonment.

The Government did not wait for the settlement of the strikes, or the putting down of the riots, to show its honest interest in the condition of the workingmen. A committee of twenty-six members of the Chambers was appointed in March, 1886, to inquire into the condition of the working people, and to formulate and present such reformatory laws as might be found needful. This committee began its sittings in April, and has since, from time to time, reported many beneficial measures.

The wages of the Belgian workingmen are low. Fortunately the cost of living is proportionately low. Our own coal miners have good reason to find fault in odd years. But, if report speak true, they have more reason to blame the operators than the Belgian miners have. There are 149 separate coal companies in Belgium. In the eight years from 1876 to 1884 one-half of these were operated at a loss, whose total amount figured up to 14,700,000 dollars. The gross profits of the paying mines within the same period amounted to 18,500,000 dollars. Had the gaining operators paid off the losses of the less fortunate companies the total profits of the business of the eight years would have been less than 4,000,000 dollars, less than 2 per cent. on the capital invested. The year 1884 was especially unfavorable. While the miners received 56 per cent. of the gross income, the operators received only 1 per cent. and a small fraction. Had the whole of the profits been given to the miners they would have had a cent a

day additional. Besides the dulness of trade that has been felt the world over, the Belgian mines have had to contend with two special factors which time cannot modify—the competition of the French and German mines and the great depth which the Belgian mines have reached. Still there were abuses that could be remedied. The “truck” system, no longer a benefit with our modern means of distribution, was found to be more extensively practised than had been supposed. The commission promptly brought in a law abolishing the system. And they have since passed a law forbidding a vicious custom that had come into vogue in the mines, the employment of young girls. The laws presented and passed, in the interest of workmen generally, are numerous. One makes it unlawful to pay a workingman's wages otherwise than in cash. Another makes inalienable two-fifths of a workingman's pay. Still another provides that, where town improvements make inroads on existing buildings, a certain proportion of the land expropriated shall be reserved for workmen's houses.

Alcoholism is the vice of the day, and the workingman's greatest enemy. Here we suffer quite enough from it. But a journey through Belgium would make a moderate American drinker think himself a total abstainer. A fair picture of the situation is given in the following extract from a Flanders journal, published in the *London Times* of Sept. 18th, 1888: “The daily consumption of a workingman—not a drunkard—is, at 5.30 A.M., a “worm killer”; at 8 A.M., an “eye-opener”; at 11 A.M., a “whip”; at 2 P.M., a “digerter”; at 5 P.M., a “soldier”; at 7.30 P.M., a “finisher.” His yearly expenditure, without counting extra drinks on festivals, is 219 francs—out of 800 to 1200 francs.” Should universal suffrage ever come to Belgium, a provision that this variety of workingman should cast his vote before 10.30 A.M. would not be amiss. Still the subject is too serious for even a passing joke; and the commission, recognizing its seriousness, brought in several bills with a view to remedying the evil. By law the number of drinking places is fixed according to population. The right to sue for public-house debts has been abolished. The sale of liquor is forbidden in disorderly houses. Every publican convicted of selling drink to an intoxicated person, or to minors, is punished with fine and imprisonment; and the same penalty attaches to every person found drunk in a public place.

In the interest of harmony between workmen and employers, and of the peaceful development of trade, the commission passed a bill establishing “Councils of Industry and Labor,” councils of conciliation made up of employers and employed. These councils have no legal standing as boards of arbitration. They are rather

standing committees of negotiation. In France they have done good service, and they are certainly an advance on "Strike Committees," hastily appointed in times of excitement. Just now the tendency is to co-operation, or some like form of corporate organization. To meet this tendency the commission reported in favor of liberty of corporate financial association.

Following Germany, though at a long distance, the commission brought in a law for the assurance of workingmen. Assurance is made obligatory, but the State takes no responsibility upon itself. The system is carried out by means of syndicates of workingmen and employers; the State does not guarantee the operations of the syndicates. Giving an impetus to a system which she assumes to be necessary under the present conditions, the State leaves the working of the system wholly to those who are directly interested in it; and here at least avoids the dangers of Bismarckian State Socialism.

Alcoholism is bad, but at its worst it is not so hurtful to society as "free love." The European laws that were made long ago to meet other social conditions are largely to blame for the debasing and mischievous system of concubinage which has developed among all classes, but especially among the workingmen. In Belgium, as in France, the law forbade a man to marry before his twenty-fifth year without the consent of his parents or guardians. And, in addition, the law had encumbered the ceremony of marriage with a number of costly formalities. Official inquiries made in France, as well as in Belgium, have proved that to these restraints on lawful marriage the prevalent habit of temporary unions is in good part chargeable. Outside of any question of morals the State has necessarily a deep interest in the regularity and permanence of the marriage tie. On this depends the very existence of the State. The Belgian Commission, having traced the social cause of the evil, promptly reported the facts, and the necessary conclusions; and Woeste, the brave supporter of Malou and Jacobs, as good a deputy as minister, promptly brought in a bill doing away with the old-time requirements as to age and parental authority, and obliging the municipalities to furnish free of charge all the papers requisite for a legal marriage, where the parties to the contract were unable to bear the expense. Liberality in the matter of documents is vastly more commendable than liberalism in the more intimate relations of the sexes.

The commission has dealt with many other details of the actual social life of Belgium. It has presented valuable reports on questions not as yet touched by legislation, and it is still engaged in studying the immediate needs of society, with a view to the future

as well as to the present welfare of the people.¹ The Belgian Radical revolutionaries did not look with favor on the appointment of the commission; nor were they pleased with the reforms it so promptly introduced. Peace and concord form no part of the creed of Belgian Liberals, Radicals, Socialists, or Anarchists. At first they sought to prevent the workingmen from going before the commission to testify as to their grievances and their real condition. There were, though, enough of sensible, law-abiding men to make the Radical scheme a failure. Then, as usual, an appeal was made to force—the strike and the riot. On January 16th, 1887, the miners at Charleroi struck. In February a committee met and voted to order a general strike. No more was heard of this decision until the middle of March, when the miners and quarrymen in certain sections stopped work. These strikes lasted only a few weeks, however. In May the movement showed new life. The colliers began; the metal workers followed. Then the mechanics and others in the towns, and especially in Ghent, Louvain, and Brussels, lent a hand. The cry was for universal suffrage and amnesty to the convicted rioters of 1886. The true source and motive of the strikes was made plain by the address of the Workmen's League at Charleroi, which invited the support of the electors on the ground that the strike was essentially political. The old tactics were followed with some slight modern improvements. Of course, the gendarmes were handled roughly, the revolver played its usual part, and dynamite was freely used to destroy bridges and private property, and even to kill "brothers" who would not join the strikers. The German and French Anarchists were on the ground, as cheery, and charitable, and crack-brained as ever. They recommended that all industrial establishments should be blown sky-high. On May 26th the Committee on General Strike made a bold move. They sent a letter to Premier Bernaert notifying him that if, by the 29th of the month, he had not decided to adopt universal suffrage, dissolve the Chambers, and call a Constituent Assembly, he alone would have to bear the responsibility for whatever calamities might occur. Meantime a Radical Congress gathered in Brussels, and on that fatal day, the 29th, they debated the question of universal suffrage. A resolu-

¹ To M. Claudio Jannet's articles, *Les Faits Économiques et le Mouvement Social*, which have appeared from time to time in *Le Correspondant*, the writer is indebted for certain details concerning the reports of this Commission. Temperately discussing, as they do, every phase of the economic and social movements of the day, these articles are of the highest value. A translation of them would be of real service to American workingmen and employers.

tion favoring it was voted down. The largest suffrage the Radicals were willing to give was an educational suffrage—a very conservative suffrage indeed. The bubble was pricked. Within a few days it had collapsed. The strikers returned to work, and partial peace reigned. Since that time there have been occasional local disturbances, but no organized general movement. When it was evident that the agitators had given up the fight, the Government showed its policy towards the rioters of 1886. As might be expected, it was a policy of moderation. On November 8th the Minister of Justice announced that the Ministry purposed a large exercise of clemency in favor of the men convicted as rioters in 1886. The extent of this measure appeared in the royal decree of December 4th, by which the terms of imprisonment of a number of the guilty parties were reduced about two-thirds.

While patiently, prudently, courageously laboring for the liberty of the citizens and internal peace, the Conservative-Catholic Ministry has been as careful of the defence of the country against external enemies. The geographical position of Belgium, bordering on the two unfriendly powers, France and Germany, renders her liable to invasion at any moment. The smallness of her population, as well as of her army, makes it evident that, if she is to preserve her neutrality in case of war, and to hinder her two warlike neighbors from turning Belgium into a frightful battle-ground, she must be protected by a strong system of fortifications. In his instructive articles on the present European military conditions, Sir Charles Dilke pointed out Belgium's dangers and her weak points. The Bernaert Ministry saw the one and the other, and at an early day took up the subject of the country's defence. After careful consultation with high military authorities, the Minister of War designed a plan of fortifications along the Meuse, intended to secure the country from invasion on the French side, where it was peculiarly exposed. When the Government's proposal was submitted to the Chamber of Deputies it met with a strong opposition from the Radical-Liberals under Frère-Orban. To explain this unpatriotic opposition is not easy. One would hesitate before charging the Radical-Liberals with a desire to expose the country to French invasion. However, the opposition was fruitless. On June 14th, 1887, the Chamber of Deputies passed the Government bill. The Senate approved it on the 24th of the same month. By this time the great work is well on the way to completion. Measures have been taken to arm these forts with the best modern cannon; and the country will soon have the satisfaction of feeling that should either Germany or France force a way into Belgian territory it will not be chargeable to Belgian neglect. The importance

of these fortifications along the Meuse is confirmed by the foreign telegrams of the month of October, 1888. The French press denounces them as "excessive measures of defence." Madame J. Adam, who knows everything, charges that there is a secret treaty between the King of the Belgians and Bismarck as against France. There are rumors that the French Government "will soon present a note to the Belgian Government expressing surprise that, being assured that its neutrality would be respected in the event of a Continental war, Belgium should take such precautions." Anonymous French staff-officers are writing letters to the press showing how unlikely it is that the Germans will want to attack France by way of Belgium, and how certain it is that France would not think of doing what Germany cannot be thinking of doing. Evidently the French would prefer to have the line of the Meuse open, or else they are busy strengthening some distant part of their own territory. And evidently the fortification of the Meuse was not begun a day too early, and cannot be finished a day too soon.

In this review of the internal and external policy of the present Conservative-Catholic Government of Belgium, we have omitted many subjects of more or less interest to the student of modern political or social life. But the world runs so fast that whoever would deal critically with four years of government in the smallest of countries must needs write a book, and not an article. The course of Belgian affairs tells more of hope and suggestion to the lovers of liberty, moderation, prudence, justice, peace and practical politics than that of any other European nationality. Rightly the world should have but two parties: the party of liberty and progress, and the party of tyranny and retrogression. In the former party all the Christian elements of society would be joined, had reason or the spirit of Christianity, or even plain interest, full sway. As it is, they are divided by supposed interests, petty interests of denomination, dynasties, clubs and cliques. Were not the French royalists and imperialists of all shades so greatly exercised about corpses, living and dead, and about words that have ceased to have a meaning, true liberty would have made vast strides in France during the last quarter of a century, and the country would not now be compelled to consider a revision of the Constitution in the interest of persons rather than of ideas. Italians have been bound hand and foot by a policy whose wisdom it is not allowed to question, but which, for the time being, has been a trying one for the friends of good government and the largest freedom. Let us hope that when diplomacy has solved the "Roman Question"—and it must in time solve it, unless European Governments are anxious that the Italian people shall, like the Irish, take

matters into their own vigorous hands—the sons of the men who suffered so much to free their country from the grasp of the foreigner, and who fought in the field and the forum for a unity of hearts, regardless of royal dynasties, may have learned from Belgium how to use wisely the government that must come under their direction, and how to accommodate themselves to realities. The sacrifice of principle can never be a question where the men who lead have only the public weal at heart. Four years of Conservative-Catholic Government in Belgium have made this clear. To-day every individual or group that favors peace, material progress, moral well-doing, freedom and independence, stands firmly by the Catholic-Conservative Government. And the Government has been careful to recognize this fact. It has a right measure of the country and the times. When in October, 1887, Thonissen resigned from the Ministry, warned by the weight of years, and anxious to finish his long-contemplated history of the criminal law before death had stopped him, the Ministry filled his place with a young lawyer, M. Lejeune, who was known as a moderate Liberal. In the work of African civilization, which now moves all foreign governments, partly from a spirit of civilization, partly from a spirit of enterprise, and not a little from a spirit of greed, Belgium has taken a leading part. Her king has been officially authorized to assume the Presidency of the Congo State, but Belgium has assumed no responsibility for the venture. Without seeking purely selfish interests, she has pointed and led the way of civilization.

Here, in the United States, the old spirit of liberty is strong. By father and son it has been nourished, cherished, North and South, East and West. But the spirit of disorder, intolerance, illiberality, force, irreligion, socialism, revolution, anarchy, grows too rapidly year by year. Counter to these harmful notions, encouraged by them, the no less fatal doctrines of centralization are making headway. Are Christians here to learn nothing from the past or the present? Are they ready to sacrifice liberty, decency, religion, the future realization of the highest of human hopes and aspirations, on the altar of sectarian prejudices and foreign spites? Seeking little things, will they lose their hold on the great things for which their fathers prayed and suffered? Surely not. Let them lift themselves beyond the narrow bounds that limit religious and national prejudices, in great part the result of imperfect education and the hypocritical, selfish efforts of parasites and designing politicians; let them seek the ground of unity, and not the line of certain division; let there be mutual sacrifice or independence in things not essential, but in essential things, where personal liberty,

common morality, the Ten Commandments, justice between individuals, are at stake, let there be unity.

To Catholics, as well as non-Catholics, the way of unity and the right method of dealing with the political and social questions of the hour have been pointed out by the Catholic-Conservative party of Belgium. In this little country the lovers of true freedom could rightly set up a statue of Liberty enlightening the world.

We should not, however, pin our faith to any party or country. The difficulties of a party really begin only when the country has shown its full confidence in certain men and measures. Then ambitions, baser interests, jobbery, and the imaginings of the *doctrinaire* begin to be felt. Large majorities create a sense of security and a spirit of carelessness which in time lead to division, harmful compromise, or positive wrong. Judging the present Belgian Ministry by its past, we may have confidence in its integrity of purpose, wide vision and patriotism; but time alone can tell what obstacles the makers of the new era may meet with from the men who now give them the most cordial support. Whatever the future, and there is every reason to have a still larger hope, let us learn the good lessons which the last four years of Belgian politics have taught all fair men who are willing to learn.

BOSTONIAN IGNORANCE OF CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

POPULAR agitation against Catholics in the United States seems to mark the years with double numbers, such as 1833, 1844, 1855, and that which has just expired has done something to merit a place in the category. The agitation of 1833 culminated in the burning of the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown by a mob, and it is strange that, in half a century of progress, the most enlightened city in the country still shows to the world that, in fifty years, it has learned nothing in some departments of human knowledge, and has thousands still slaves of ignorant prejudice, ready to be swayed and led on by fanatical appeals. The good people of Boston know a great deal more about electricity, early Greek art, the site of Troy, Egyptian antiquities, the mineral resources of America, methods of manufacture, than they did fifty years ago; but in regard to the Catholic Church, its organization, doctrines, worship and polity, they seem not to have learned an iota. And what is true of that city, which boasts of its superior culture, is true of many other places.

The intellectual attitude of the mass of non-Catholics towards us is one of the most curious problems in the world. When Catholics were few in this country, and foreign travel uncommon; when the Catholic religion was believed to be something that flourished in the Middle Ages, and disappeared in modern times; when, as a Lord Chancellor of England, once, putting the whole matter for that country, declared that Catholics, in the eye of the law, were not supposed to exist in England, one could understand to some extent that all knowledge about them might be supposed to lurk only among learned professors in colleges who studied the matter up in order to obtain a definite idea of the European nations during the Middle Ages; but when every large city has, in its churches, colleges, schools and charitable institutions, evidences that Catholicity is an actual and active reality; when town and village show the same in proportion, it is amazing beyond conception that people will wallow in ignorance, or rest on the narrow circle of old wives' tales handed down by prejudice, rather than examine for themselves. Although Catholic books and periodicals can be had on all sides, they are never examined; no effort is made to acquire information. Indeed, in many minds there is the latent, if unexpressed, idea that Catholic books are imbued with a kind of witchcraft; that they have some subtle power that blinds a person to

his better judgment if he touches them, and convinces him against his will and his reason.

Nearly fifty years ago Catholics in New York, who had been deprived, for no fault of theirs, of a share of the school money, asked its restoration, showing that in the schools of the Public School Society, a private corporation which enjoyed the monopoly, there were books and teaching so imbued with hostility or contempt for Catholics that they could not send their children to them. The Protestant clergy rallied to the support of the School Society, every old charge possible was revived against Catholics, and a new one, utterly false, that Catholics had asked to have the Bible banished from the schools, became a stock accusation, maintained to this day, and which still finds dupes to believe it.

So, this year, in Boston, an American priest called the attention of the School Board to a misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine by a teacher. That gentleman fell back on a history used in the schools, and continued to present his views of Catholic doctrine in more and more offensive forms, till the Board struck the book from the list and assigned the teacher to another department. Then, as fifty years ago, numbers of Protestant clergymen who, not without good grounds, consider the public schools part of their system and property, began a vehement campaign against the Catholic religion, denouncing it, and all who adhered to it, in every possible form. Many of the leading newspapers aided the onslaught. The whole matter became a political issue, and even women were stimulated to rush to the polls to save their religion, if not their lives and homes. And, in fact, they voted by thousands, knowing as little as the men what the merits of the case really were. If it has been right that Protestants should have exclusive control of the public schools, as they have had these many years, it must be equally right for Catholics to do the same when they can. A Protestant journal says: "It is abominable that this very denomination should be at the same time struggling to get control of their management, their text-books, and their teachers." If the control by Catholics would be abominable, that by Protestants must be, if both are citizens with equal rights.

What an indulgence is, as taught by the Catholic Church, could be as easily ascertained as what an electric dynamo is. The Catholic Church is an institution existing throughout the world. It has the decrees of Councils, defining its faith. It has dogmatic and catechetical works for the ordinary guidance of its priesthood and the instruction of the faithful. Any person of common sense would say: Let us examine these and take the definitions given there. But people of common sense seem few in number. Objections are made that the books used by Catholics in this country

are adapted for Protestant countries, yet books printed in Catholic countries might readily be had. If others averred that doctrines had changed, and that, in former times, different definitions were given, and different ideas and practices prevailed, still the fact remains that printing was invented in Catholic times, and that for more than half a century before Protestantism arose, and down to this time, presses have teemed with Catholic books. It would be the easiest thing in the world for any great library, like Harvard, to make a collection of Catholic books, showing what indulgences were held to be, at all times, and in all countries, from the invention of printing to the present time. This would be the best primary evidence on that point, as a collection of missals would be of the form of the liturgy during that period.

Yet, in all that was written, said and printed during the heated discussion in Boston, no one seems to have taken this plain, common-sense way of ascertaining what Catholics hold an indulgence to be.

There are quaint little handbooks, like DeBurgo's *Pupilla Oculi*, 1510; the *Discipulus de Eruditione Christi Fidelium*, 1504; *Manipulus Clericorum*, 1530, printed for the use of the parochial clergy in England, France and Germany, which would afford any really honest inquirer a knowledge of what doctrine was then actually taught the people from the pulpit; but it is useless even to expect any such intelligent examination. Catholics puzzled at the mental phenomenon of intelligent people preferring darkness to light, and error to truth, can only pray that God would "take away the veil from their hearts."

The result of the Boston agitation was not commensurate with the energy expended. With the pulpit and press inciting the people, with women summoned to the polls, the effect was slight compared to other days. "Sometimes a convent, then a church we burn," did not hold good; but by almost superhuman exertion they succeeded in defeating a Catholic gentleman, who, after holding the office of Mayor of Boston for four terms, a duration well-nigh unexampled in the municipal history of that city, was defeated when a candidate for the fifth time; and they gave one more proof of the essentially Protestant character of the public schools by preventing the election of any Catholic to the School Board. As these same people are complaining of Catholics for withdrawing their children from the public schools, it was rather unwise to make their anti-Catholic spirit and management so distinctly apparent.

The spirit of hostility to the Church, which showed itself fifty or sixty years ago in the violence committed by the poor misguided dupes of men who should have known better, and had

hearts to teach them better, still prevails, and on occasion can be roused, but it is less generally diffused, and is diminishing in intensity. The sermons of 1888 led to none of the crimes caused by those of earlier days.

Protestantism is losing its hold even in New England. The population of Colonial stock are dwindling in numbers, and the churches show a decline greater even than proportionate numerical loss. The young rarely become church members, the Sunday School and Young Men's Christian Associations seem to supplant rather than aid the churches. Protestantism never was a religion, nor had the elements of one. It has no priesthood, no settled dogma, no essential act of divine worship. In our times the cold Calvinistic church service repels, as the Episcopal, with its new trappings, its vestments, its light, its spirit of gladness, seems to attract Protestants. The Methodists and Baptists have outlived their early energy. The decline is so distinctly felt that recruits for the ministry are few. Zealous men are studying and devising how to draw promising young men to the ministry; but no result has been reached. In many parts, especially in New England, where churches formerly had a large membership, it has dwindled so that they cannot secure ministers. There have been conventions to know what is to be done to save these churches. Where they are of the same denomination, congregations can unite, and so defer for a time the imminent dissolution. But in many cases there are four or five churches in a little town, each belonging to a different organization. "A township of 5000 population seldom has more than three churches," says a Protestant paper, "*one of which is Roman Catholic, and is always well filled*, and these churches will not seat more than 1200. The number of people at all the churches on any Sunday morning is scarcely 600." Schemes for a union of denominations have been taken up, and there is a journal, *The Church Union*, especially devoted to advocating such a blending together. The International Bible Lesson for Sunday Schools tends that way, and on Thanksgiving Day, which, in the memory of living men, saw every Protestant church well filled, it is now usual in many places to hold a union service; the most eloquent minister is selected, and he can barely fill one church, while several others are closed and empty. But effectual union is prevented by many minor causes, that of church-property not being the least. The questions of doctrine, church government and form of service present great difficulties; not a denomination has any for which any positive authority can be shown, but each clings to its own, as though a matter of positive divine revelation. With all the labor to effect a union, not a step has been gained, not even the different bodies of a single denomination have been

brought together. "You have had your Evangelical Alliance for nearly fifty years, you have had your famous Pan-Presbyterian Alliance for at least twelve years," wrote Rev. Dr. Dabney, when he proceeded to show that they had effected absolutely nothing. Meanwhile, the gradual disintegration goes on. So far as the Catholic Church is concerned, any union between it and the sects that have separated from it, and from each other, has, of course, become impossible. Men like Fénelon, Leibnitz, Bishop Doyle, believed it practicable, in their day, but what might have been possible in the seventeenth century, is no longer so.

There is a remarkable difference between the earlier Oriental heresies and those of the West now embodied in Protestantism. The former turned almost entirely on questions relating to our Lord; but each body, as formed apart from the Church, retained a hierarchy, priesthood, the Mass as the only sacrifice or public divine worship of the New Law, the sacraments and most Catholic practices. The Greek schism touched the Papacy as the continuous headship of Peter. For all or any of these bodies to unite with the Catholic Church again, required but little. If any body, like the Eutychians recently, who, after being fourteen centuries out of the Church, formally disavows, by an authoritative act, the particular heretical doctrine it has held, it comes back with its apostolic succession, valid orders, Mass and sacraments. All goes on externally as before, but they are Catholics. Even the Greek Church in Russia, Greece and Turkey could, by a simple act recognizing the supremacy of the Pope, restore millions upon millions to the unity of faith. It would require no change in the form of church government, or in the Mass, or in the administration of the sacraments, and very little even in the doctrinal teaching.

But the Protestant movement carried with it few bishops, and abandoned necessarily the priesthood and the Mass. It has no episcopate with apostolic succession, no duly ordained priesthood, no sacrifice of the New Law, and now virtually no sacraments, even if there were those who could validly administer them. There is nothing on their side by which a union can be effected. They are mere secessionists, and to come back to the union must acknowledge the general government of the Church and its organization. They have not kept for three centuries what the Eutychians did for fourteen, but must recover it all, and that cannot be done without, but only within the Church. No Protestant body can come into the Church, though individuals can and do.

Providence is shaping events so that even in New England the faith is gaining a firm hold that would have been deemed impossible a few years ago. The fact that Boston has at four successive

elections chosen an Irish Catholic for Mayor; that in the School Board of that city there are even now eight Catholic members, shows a large Catholic body and influence in Boston; the more so as Catholic energy centring on the erection and maintenance of parochial schools, our people generally have come to the conviction that no really just and fair system of public schools is possible, and that the best devised system would constantly be made an instrument of oppression. Hence their interest in the public schools has decreased; they leave them to their fellow-citizens of other beliefs and unbeliefs.

The growth of the Catholic body in New England, by natural increase, by immigration from Europe and the descendants of more recent incomers, and by the wonderful influx of French Canadians who came at first merely as denizens, but now remain, become citizens and settle down to make the land their home. They have able leaders like Gagnon, their literary associations, priests, churches, convents, schools, they are bilingual, speaking both French and English, and increase rather than diminish the influence of their brethren in Canada. A recent estimate fixes the number of French Canadians in the United States at 800,000, five hundred thousand in New York and New England.

The whole Catholic population of New England by the latest data is, in Maine, 70,000; New Hampshire, so long bitterly hostile to Catholics, 73,000; Vermont, 50,000; Massachusetts, 715,000; Rhode Island, 150,000; Connecticut, 175,000; a total of 1,248,000 in a population of 4,000,000 in 1880. In Rhode Island the Catholic population is fully half that of the State; in Connecticut $\frac{1}{3}$ ths; in Massachusetts, $\frac{2}{3}$ ths; the rate in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont is smaller, ranging from one-fifth to one-ninth.

Now, supposing all Catholic immigration to cease, the Catholic gain would be steady. Of 6638 children born alive in New Hampshire, 2410, or four out of every eleven, were baptized in Catholic churches; in Vermont, 2235 out of 7350 born alive; in Massachusetts, 28,000 out of 42,735, fully two-thirds; and in large cities like Boston the Catholic baptisms have for many years exceeded half the number of children born. The births in Boston in 1887 numbered 12,137, while the Catholic baptisms were 7382, showing that more than half the new native population of that city is Catholic and of Catholic parentage. This proportion is all the more striking, as within a few years suburban towns of old Puritanic origin have been brought within the city limits. So, in Bridgeport, Connecticut, three Catholic churches, in 1887, baptized 463; in Manchester, N. H., of 1390 children born, 930 were baptized in Catholic Churches. In Connecticut it is 6700 out of 14,027, or nearly half, and in Rhode Island 3602 out of 6798, or more

than half. Taking all New England together, of 77,548 children born alive, at least 43,000 were baptized in Catholic churches. The Catholic body would, therefore, independent of all accessions by immigration from Europe or Canada, gain steadily. It is a common delusion that the majority of Catholics in the United States are of foreign birth. It was not so at the Revolution, and cannot be proved to have been so at any period. In 1880 the foreign-born population was some 6,300,000; the Catholic body numbered 7,500,000; and not more than half the foreign born can be regarded as Catholic; even allowing 3,500,000 as their number, this would leave 4,000,000 native-born Catholics in the country.

As the Catholic births far exceed the general average of the country, this native body is growing at the rate of 250,000 a year.

Let us consider New England under another phase.

Place some of the old Puritan Fathers in Boston and other New England towns to-day. Irish Catholics, whom Ward, one of their ministers, characterized in his "Simple Cobbler of Aggawam" as "Bots of the Beast's Tail," would be seen by them filling the land with their descendants; Catholics of Portuguese origin, almost as hateful as Irish, swarm in all the fishing towns; German Catholics are found everywhere; the Catholics of Canada, for whose annihilation the old Puritan pulpits so constantly rang with appeals that every wall echoed them, now pour down like an irresistible torrent on their New England, conquered but conquering in turn. The Puritans of olden days would be appalled; but they would go to the meeting-houses to revive their spirits and the old religious ideas which they had founded. Here, surely, they would expect consolation and relief. They strenuously taught the doctrine of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the Atonement, Baptismal Regeneration, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Church as the kingdom of God and a power in a Christian commonwealth; they believed in a Christian education of the young, and from the very primer where their little ones learned their letters they imbued them with these vital doctrines. But in the meeting-houses of to-day they would hear all these things ignored or derided and denied; and if they spoke of religious education in the schools, they would be crushed with sarcasm, taunt, ridicule and pretentious arrogance. They would leave the meeting-houses with sad and heavy hearts, and, looking up at cross-crowned spires, would gnash their teeth and regard the evil result as the work of these Catholic intruders who had come into their fair heritage. But, if mustering courage they entered the Catholic churches, what would be their amazement to hear every one of these doctrines boldly, fearlessly and plainly taught; they would see men called to adore the Holy Trinity, to look up to Jesus

Christ as our Redeemer, making atonement for us, wiping away original sin; they would hear the Scriptures read as the inspired word of God, not put on a level with the Zendavesta and the Koran; they would hear of baptismal regeneration, and constantly and steadily would hear the necessity inculcated of blending religion with education from the first dawn of reason. Would they not in utter amazement cast up their hands and cry: *Ergo erravimus?* "Therefore we have erred from the way of truth, and the light of justice has not shined unto us:" "These are they, whom we had some time in derision, and for a parable of reproach." "Behold how they are numbered among the children of God."

They would turn from their degenerate descendants and admit that the house they had erected was built on sand, and that Christian hope was in the Catholic Church.

In sober reality such Christian truths as were taught in New England in old Puritan days are now taught there distinctly only by the Catholic Church. It is really continuing the work of the old Puritans.

Anti-Catholic prejudice has outlived the doctrines of the Protestant churches in New England and throughout the country. Secular education has bred a dry rot on the churches, and they are sensibly decaying. There is zeal in Sunday-schools, but these institutions, while made so as to attract and interest children, do not lead them to love and take part in the church service; they simply replace it for the young who, after growing up in Sunday-schools, are virtually strangers to the church, and find nothing there to interest them. It is as if our children were taught their catechism, but were never taken to Mass, and allowed to grow up ignorant of it and its meaning and consolations. As a matter of course, few would attend it.

In 1888 the anti-Catholic movement rose and fell in Boston; but did not spread through the country, although the old Know-Nothing organization has been revived and is active, with papers in several parts especially devoted to their cause; but every year the increasing numbers and influence of Catholics render their efforts less and less hurtful to the country. It will never again put a Presidential candidate in the field, but confine itself to underhand working in order to defeat an obnoxious candidate put forward by one of the two great parties, or beset enough Senators to prevent the confirmation of some Catholic nominated by the President.

The war on the parochial schools begun in Massachusetts may be revived and imitated elsewhere, but this seems scarcely probable. It failed in the first grand onset, and it will not be easy to rally the same strength again.

To all appearance the periodical attack on the Catholic body has passed, and if it is renewed in the last year of the century, it will, so far as human foresight can estimate the future, be feeble indeed, for the Catholic body, numbering twenty-five out of seventy-five millions, will be too respectable a minority to be easily crushed.

When we consider that Congregationalism was once not only the dominant, but actually the State Church in all parts of New England except Rhode Island, the refuge of the Baptists, the status of Congregationalism, as shown by the census of 1880, is perfectly amazing, in the decline which it shows. In Massachusetts, its very heart and centre, the descendants of the Separatists and Puritans have so fallen away from the faith and church of their ancestors, that only 91,787, or 5 per cent. of a population of 1,783,012 were members of the Congregational Church. In Connecticut, where Yale College did so much to save them, there were, indeed, 55,852, or 9 per cent. of the whole population; New Hampshire Congregational churches could boast of 20,547 members, being 6 per cent. of the population, and Vermont 20,117, being the same proportion. In Maine, so long an appendage of Massachusetts, there were 21,645 members of Congregational churches, barely $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. while the Methodists had 25,883 members, and the Baptists 21,165. The decline in Rhode Island amongst its dominant denomination was as marked, for, in a population of 276,528, the Baptist churches had only 10,839 members, about 4 per cent. of the population.

The evidence is unmistakable that the young people growing up do not and will not become members of the Protestant churches.

In other words, allowing for those under twelve years of age, at least 75 out of every 100 no longer regard the ordinances of the Congregational church as at all necessary means to aid them to save their souls. To the question: "What shall I do to be saved?" they will not take as an answer: "Become church-members."

PROGRESS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARNELL COMMISSION.

THE Parnell Commission may be taken as a test and illustration of the condition of Ireland. It is the encysted ganglion of the national disease at present. To dissect this tumor will show the method of the malady.

The Commission, though still current, may fairly be judged by its progress from its first meeting, on September 17th, to its adjournment for a month on December 20th. In this time the Commission had thirty-one sittings. A review of the proceedings will compel opinion as to whether or not the *London Times* has cleared itself of the dreadful suspicion of publishing forged letters designed to ruin Mr. Parnell, and also whether the Tory Government is justified in using the Commission to parade a mass of alleged Irish crime and "outrage" which has no relation to Mr. Parnell or the charges of the *Times* against him.

Early in July last a libel suit was decided in London which had been brought against the *London Times* by a man named Frank Hugh O'Donnell, a writer in a London Tory paper, who had been a Home Rule member of Parliament. O'Donnell, however, had long ago earned the thorough distrust and dislike of the whole body of Irish representatives, and had been rejected as one of their number.

The *Times* had at this time adopted a system of making offensive and even criminal charges against members of the Irish party in Parliament and daring them to take action for libel.

A year and a half ago the *Times* published a letter bearing Mr. Parnell's signature, and dated May 15th, 1882, addressed to Mr. Patrick Egan, showing a complicity in the assassinations by "the Invincibles," the society to which James Carey, the informer, belonged, and for the deeds of which several men were executed in that year. This letter was so flagrant a forgery, even to the eye, but more so to the common sense, that it fell flat even in England, and produced an effect directly contrary to the wish and purpose of the *Times*. In Ireland and America it was universally referred to as "the *Times* forgery," and was received with ridicule.

Mr. Parnell took no notice of the slander, nor of the angry challenges of the *Times* to "come into court and defend yourself."

It was not understood then (to any but the Irish members, probably) that the *Times* actually relied on the prejudices or dis-

honesty of English judges and jurors to come off without a penalty; but the formation and action of the Special Commission now in existence establishes a startling connivance between the Government and the libelling paper.

When Mr. Parnell and his associates were thus leaving the *Times* alone, and winning by their forbearance, a bogus action for libel was begun against the *Times* by the above-named O'Donnell. In this action O'Donnell made almost no pretence of supporting a case; he went just far enough to allow the counsel for the *Times* (the Attorney-General of England) to make a speech of injurious import against the Nationalist party, renewing all the *Times'* libels, and producing in court a heap of documents used to prove that the Irish National League was an association for the manufacture of outrage and crime, that it had instigated the Phoenix Park murders, and that Mr. Parnell was cognizant of its evil doings.

Among these papers was a letter alleged to be in Mr. Parnell's handwriting, and to have been smuggled from Kilmainham jail, addressed to Patrick Egan, saying :

"What are these fellows waiting for? Inaction is inexpedient. Our best men are in prison. Nothing has been done. End this hesitancy. Make it hot for old Forster."

Other letters were produced tending to show that Mr. Parnell had assisted Mr. Byrne, an alleged Invincible, to escape, and that he had maintained communication with and received money from Mr. Egan and others, who were alleged to be criminals.

On the conclusion of the Attorney-General's speech, the Lord Chief-Justice charged strongly, against O'Donnell, of course, and a verdict was given for the *Times*. Thereupon a still louder outcry arose—this time from other Tory papers besides the *Times*—to Mr. Parnell to "come into court" and defend his character.

Mr. Parnell, on the day following, arose in Parliament and denounced as absolute forgeries the letters with his signature published in the *Times* and read in court by the Attorney-General. The letter dated May 15, 1882, had his signature in a form he had not attached to a letter since 1879, when he had adopted, for special reasons, a different style. "The great majority of the letters read at the trial," Mr. Parnell continued, "are palpable forgeries. If they are credited it must be supposed that I deliberately put myself in the power of a murderer; that I was accessory to the Phoenix Park murders before and after the fact, and that I entered Kilmainham jail desiring to assassinate Mr. Forster. The absurdity of the whole series of letters, with a few exceptions, shows them to be forgeries."

Mr. Egan cabled from America that the letters were forgeries, and offered to go to England and prove it if he were promised protection.

Still the *Times* cried out that Mr. Parnell was bound to "come into court." But other great English papers accepted the Irish leader's dignified word as conclusive proof that he had been foully slandered. The *Daily News* summed up a powerful leader with these words:

"Mr. Parnell's plain and frank words effectually dispose of the absurd charges made against him by dupes and partisans. He has done his duty by exploding before the House of Commons and the country fictions which would scarcely have deceived a well-regulated nursery."

And then the tide turned for a time, and set in favor of the Home Rulers, the first wave splashing dismay in the faces of *Times* and Tories.

This first wave was a question by Sir Frederick Lawson, an English Home Ruler, asking whether or not the Government would appoint a Committee of the House of Commons to inquire into the charges made against the Irish Nationalist members. Mr. Parnell followed with a direct motion for the appointment of such a Committee, and asked the Government to appoint a day to discuss the subject and give him an opportunity "to repel the foul and unfounded charges made against him by Attorney-General Webster in the trial of the suit of Mr. O'Donnell against the *Times*."

In reply, the Government, through its leader, Mr. W. H. Smith, declined to give a day for the discussion, and also declined to appoint a Committee of Inquiry.

This action of the Government created a strong feeling in favor of Mr. Parnell; and the Tory Government rapidly learned that a step had been taken that must be recalled. Accordingly, a few days later, the Government leader, Mr. Smith, introduced a motion proposing, not a Parliamentary inquiry, which would be at least open and general, but a Special Commission, to be composed of three judges—appointed by the Government.

Weeks of heated discussion followed the announcement, which was soon backed up by another to the effect that the three judges were to have power to inquire into all kinds of crime in Ireland, whether or not connected with the *Times'* charges against the Irish members.

The judges selected by the Government, Hannen, Day and Smith, were objectionable, two of them being pronouncedly anti-Irish, one of the two, Justice Day, being a notorious hater of the Irish people and their National movement. An English member, a man of national repute, a leading London journalist (Labouchere), declared that Judge Day was unfit to serve on the Commission, "because in a recent trial of three Irishmen for assault, held in Liverpool, Justice Day had said that such a dastardly, cowardly and brutal crime could not have happened in England, except among the Irish."

Mr. Parnell, moved by a patriotic spirit, foreseeing danger to his country, urged the House to recollect that they were discussing a proposal to provide a substitute for the jury. "While in England a jury of twelve was always provided, it was proposed that the settlement of an important, far-reaching Irish issue be involved in an inquiry to depend upon the verdict of two men."

An eminent English member, Mr. John Morley, perhaps the first Liberal in the country in influence, after Mr. Gladstone, created a sensation by saying that "a gentleman having peculiar means of knowing Justice Day's mind upon Irish affairs" had written informing him that he (Justice Day) was "like Torquemada, a Tory of the high-flyer, non-juror type; that he nightly railed against Mr. Parnell and his friends; that he regarded them as infidels and rebels; that he believed them guilty of any crime." There were loud cries of "name!" and Mr. Morley named his informant—an eminent colleague of Justice Day's on the Belfast Riot Commission. "Surely," concluded Mr. Morley, "in the face of a feeling of this kind toward Justice Day, the Government will not retain him on the Commission, against which there ought to be no whisper raised."

Mr. Parnell earnestly urged that the Government could no longer plead ignorance in regard to a Commission composed of two Conservatives and one Unionist. "The world would know to-morrow," he said, "that the Government's idea of fairness was that the Nationalists should be tried by a jury of three English political opponents."

But the Government had picked their men, and meant to stick to them, for their own purposes; and as they had the votes, these three judges were appointed as the Special Commission.

Then followed a hopeless fight, joined in by English Liberals side by side with Irish Home Rulers, to compel or induce the Government to limit the scope of the inquiry into the charges of the *Times* and its alleged Parnell letters. In the course of this discussion occurred the now historical castigation of Joseph Chamberlain by Parnell, and the first application of the title "Judas" to Mr. Chamberlain by T. P. O'Connor. Mr. Parnell's scourge was drawn in comment on some suggestion made by Chamberlain. He said :

"My recollection of Mr. Chamberlain is that before he was a Minister he was always anxious to put the Irish party forward to do the work which he himself was afraid to do. After he became Minister he was always most anxious to betray to the Irish party the secrets of the Cabinet, and to endeavor while in the Cabinet to undermine their councils and plans in the interest of the Irish party. If the inquiry be extended to these matters I shall be able to make good my words by documentary and other evidence—that has not been forged."

The ensuing discussion, to limit the scope of the inquiry to direct charges, is of much importance, as it shows what the result was intended by the Government to be, and illumines the purpose of the Commission in hearing all kinds of evidence retailing stories of crime or conspiracy in Ireland.

Mr. Sexton, pungent as usual, directly charged that the Government leader, Mr. Smith, was in league with the *Times*' editor, Mr. Walter, and that the funds and machinery of the national treasury were at the disposal of the *Times*. Mr. Sexton said:

"Walter at first did not wish that other persons should be included in the investigation, but when he visited Mr. Smith he knew that the letters he had published in the *Times* would be proved to be forgeries, that his charges against members would break down, and that the only chance he had of escaping disgrace and the ruin of the *Times* was to get a roving inquiry into the conduct of persons over whom members had no control, and thus mislead the public mind."

This clear opinion was an actual foresight of what is likely to happen and has already happened. The Government, confident of its majority, made little show of defending its motive or intent, but sullenly sat and waited for the vote, taking the scorn and argument of Liberals and Home Rulers with the same stolid indifference. They refused, by a party vote, to have the Parnell letters specially inquired into. The motion had been made by an English member. "It now appears," said the caustic Sir Wm. Vernon Harcourt, ex-Home Secretary, "that the Government's object in creating the Commission was not to give the Irish members an opportunity to clear themselves of foul and calumnious charges, but to inquire into a political organization—not to clear, but to blacken, the characters of the Nationalists."

But the Government had its purpose settled; the closure was applied to stop further suggestion or exposure; the Irish members walked out of the House in a body—and the bill was passed.

Then Mr. Parnell entered suit in the Scottish Courts against the London *Times*, claiming £50,000 damages on account of the forged letters. The *Times*, frightened at the first show of retaliation, tried to evade the legal test, after all its loud challenges to "come into court," and urged that the Scottish Courts had no jurisdiction. This was overruled, and the trial is proceeding in Scotland by law at the same time that it progresses in England by the arbitrary will of three partisan judges.

The first result of the Commission was a national and international movement to raise money for the defence of Mr. Parnell. It was recognized at once that the Commission would involve him in enormous expenses, and that both his fortune and good name were at stake. Mr. Gladstone was one of the first to point

this out to Englishmen. In a speech at Burslem, in August last, he said :

"The charges against Mr. Parnell would, if proved, destroy everything he valued—political power and position. But he is going to be tried on vague general charges. I will never believe Mr. Parnell guilty of personal dishonor. The inquiry by the Commission may last for years, which would mean pecuniary ruin for Mr. Parnell, while the expense to the *Times* would be a mere flea bite. Regarding the action brought in Edinburgh by Mr. Parnell against the *Times*, Mr. Parnell will be certain to get justice. If the letters were forged, he may get substantial damages; but a special clause in the Commission Bill indemnifies the *Times* if the charges are not made good. That is a specimen of the Government's sense of equality."

The Parnell Defence Fund was simultaneously opened in England, Ireland, the United States, Canada, and the Australias.

An address, issued in this country in August, 1888, by Mr. John Fitzgerald, President of the Irish National League of America, called forth an excited opposition from the united Tory press of England. This address, in terse language, stated the whole case, dwelling strongly on the suit in the Scottish courts. The following extract was the special cause of the Tory protest, though it was almost a repetition of the expressions of eminent English Liberals in Parliament :

"Mr. Parnell seeks from a Scottish jury the justice that could not be obtained from the British Parliament nor from London law courts liable to the interference of corrupt Government officials. Armed with unanswerable evidence, Mr. Parnell asks a jury of honest Scotchmen to convict the proprietors of the *Times* of uttering forged letters and of attempting by such criminal means to destroy the reputations of honest men.

"To prevent that result and its attendant consequences, the coffers of the London *Times* will be supplemented by the secret-service money at the disposal of the Government, and no means that can safely help to defeat the ends of justice will be left untried by this Cabinet, so experienced in all the darksome ways abhorrent to honest men. In such a critical position Mr. Parnell must not be left to fight unaided. The Irish race must not permit their leader to fail in his efforts to secure a fair hearing of his cause for mere want of funds to carry on what must be an expensive suit. It is our cause he is fighting. It is we who through him are assailed by this combination of perjurers and forgers, and it is incumbent upon us to stand loyally by him and give him that financial support which the circumstances may demand. A Parnell defense fund should be inaugurated in every State without delay."

The Parnell Commission, as it is universally called, opened its first session in London on September 17th, 1888. The court in which the sittings are held (the Probate Court) is a very limited room, and the crowding at first was excessive, over 200 reporters, representing English, Irish and American papers, being present.

Sir Charles Russell, Q.C., M.P., and Mr. Herbert H. Asquith, M.P. for the east division of Fife, were the first counsel for the Irish side. Before opening the regular proceedings Justice Hannen asked Sir Charles Russell for whom he appeared.

"I represent eighty-four Irish Members of Parliament," was the reply. Several other lawyers of distinction have since been added.

The counsel for the *Times* were the Attorney-General (Sir Richard Webster), Sir Henry James, Q.C., and Mr. W. Graham, with Mr. John Atkinson, Q.C., and Mr. Ronan, of the Irish bar.

The case opened with a demand by Mr. Parnell's counsel for the production of the originals of the letters published by the *Times*. The judges evaded this first appeal to their justice, saying that it was understood "that the *Times* would produce all the letters and documents affecting Mr. Parnell and the others against whom it brought charges;" but adding this saving clause for the *Times*: "But if the parties cannot agree as to the production of the papers, the judges will deal with the disputed points in chambers afterwards." Of course the *Times*' lawyers could not agree; but the counsel for Mr. Parnell stopped proceedings by insisting that this question be at once decided. The judges retired to deliberate, and returned with the decision that they should order the production of the letters demanded by the counsel for Mr. Parnell.

"The result so far," wrote a member of Parliament who was present, "is satisfactory to the Irish party. The judges seem to realize that they are standing in the glare of a fierce light, with the eyes of the whole world upon them. They are judging a case as important as the impeachment of Warren Hastings or the trial of Charles I. No matter what their personal predilections or politics may be, they see the necessity for caution and impartiality. That gives great strength to the Irish cause."

This sanguine observer has since had reason to change his opinion. From the opening day, with one or two exceptions, the judges have steadily ruled against the Irish side and in favor of the *Times*. One of these exceptions was, however, very important. Late in October the judges ordered the *Times* to produce certain forged letters supplied by their agent in America, Roberts, which even the *Times* had discovered to be forgeries.

Before the sessions were two weeks old public patience was exhausted, and the tactics of the *Times* and the commissioners were generally understood. The court was no longer crowded. The Attorney-General made an interminable opening speech of many days' delivery, in which he rehashed the old stories and charges of the O'Donnell trial, going out of his way at every sentence to extend the unsupported slanders and embrace new names in his charges. He outlined a scheme of taking Ireland, county by county, and presenting every breach of the peace and every alleged "outrage" for eight years past, without making any attempt to prove their connection with the National League, much less the responsibility of the Irish leaders. He concluded his monstrous

speech by stating that men who had actually participated in outrages would be called as witnesses, and they would tell what moneys had been paid to them, and how the crimes they were hired to commit had been arranged.

From the address of the Attorney-General it was at last learned that the *Times'* case against Mr. Parnell is that in 1879 he became an ally of Michael Davitt in founding the Land League, a conspiracy which aimed at uniting the farmers of Ireland in a strike against rent, and ultimately at the separation of Ireland from England; that in the promotion of the objects of the League Mr. Parnell and Mr. Davitt made use of the moonlighter, the dynamitard and the assassin. And in support of this contention the *Times* put in evidence letters of Mr. Parnell justifying the Phoenix Park murders; letters and articles which have appeared in America advocating the use of dynamite; and speeches made in Ireland and in America, which incited to the committal of outrages and murders, and brought them about.

It was hoped that the inquiry would at least become interesting when the witnesses came up for examination; but even this was a disappointment. The *Times* presented witness after witness of the same indescribable "informer" kind, varied by the testimony of Irish constabulary inspectors, and of persons who had suffered from any agrarian or other association or from personal vengeance.

The informers' evidence was easily riddled by cross-examination. They broke down almost without exception. Not a scintilla of evidence worth hearing has yet been produced to connect the Nationalist members with the alleged outrages, though this was the special province of the informers.

Of course there were many dramatic scenes and memorable moments. Late in November a zealous police inspector from Ireland was asked on cross-examination "how long he had been engaged in getting up a case for the *Times*?" The *Times'* counsel objected, whereupon Sir Charles Russell exclaimed: "We charge and intend to prove that the whole executive authority in Ireland, even including the resident magistrates, is engaged in getting up the *Times'* case."

The witnesses for the *Times*, up to the day of adjournment in December, were, in the main, men whose testimony was as questionable as their characters. Never since Falstaff's ragged company has such a crew been gathered for imperial service. A few examples are worth giving:

Early in November, in a London tavern opposite the law courts, two men quarrelled, and one tried to murder the other by shooting him with a revolver. The would-be murderer was arrested, and was found to be a chief witness for the *Times*, a farrier from Tralee,

"a dirty, repulsive-looking fellow," says the English report, named Joseph Kavanagh. The other man was Patrick Lane, an intense Irishman, who keeps a shoemaker's shop in London, but who was playing the part of a perjurer, receiving money and instructions from the *Times'* counsel, and giving information of his discoveries to friends of the Irish members. Lane and Kavanagh had met, and Kavanagh had confided to Lane, whom he regarded as a fellow-informer, that he was going to swear that Irish leaders had paid him money to commit outrages; that the *Times'* solicitor gave him all the money he wanted, paid for his board and lodging, and paid him £6 a week for pocket money. (The accuracy of these stories has been fully verified by the Irish counsel.) At last Kavanagh discovered that Lane was not an informer to be trusted, a quarrel ensued, and the real informer and outrage-monger, armed, of course, drew his revolver and attempted to murder the man who knew him to be a hired perjurer.

This affair throws a lurid light on the quality of the *Times'* evidence. When Kavanagh was arrested he defied the authorities, and boasted that the *Times* would look after him. His boast came true, for next day, when he was arraigned, Solicitor Langham announced that he had been instructed by the *Times* to defend the prisoner. Lane, on oath, told the whole story, gloried in the practical joke he had played on the *Times*, because, as he said, their solicitor, Soames, was sending his agents out to suborn evidence designed to damn and blacken the character of honest men; "but," added Lane, doing his best to add an inch or two to his low stature, "he won't manufacture this Paddy into an informer."

The court laughed, and the laugh became a prolonged roar, when, in extenuation of the fact that he had bobbed his head very low when Kavanagh fired, he laid down this deliciously Hibernian aphorism: "It is better to be a coward five minutes than to be dead all your lifetime." The utmost ingenuity of the *Times'* solicitor failed to shake the evidence of Lane and his witnesses, and the prisoner Kavanagh was remanded. It is not likely that he will be punished for his crime; but the *Times* evidently has lost a valuable witness.

In the first week of December the *Times* produced a ready witness named Walsh, who swore that, while he was assistant secretary of the National League, he manufactured outrages at the request of the local leaders of the League. On cross-examination even the judges were surprised when Walsh confessed himself a burglar and a forger, and that he had only consented to give evidence for the *Times* when the police threatened prosecution for forgery.

An attempt was made to create a sensation over the testimony as to Lord Mountmorres' murder, his widow appearing in

court in deep mourning. An informer named Burke, however, told too much. He said that about fourteen years ago he took a secret oath in England. He returned to Ireland, and with some of his fellows planned the death of Lord Mountmorres. He told the names of the men who were guilty, and he ascribed their orders to the Land League. In reply to Sir Charles Russell he confessed himself utterly unable to explain anything with regard to the secret oath, to the establishment of the Land League, or to the manner of Mountmorres' death.

Another hoax in which the *Times* was the victim was the case of Patrick Molloy, of Dublin, who became their paid agent. One of the Invincibles of 1882 was named Molloy, and the *Times* was led to believe that a young man of that name in Dublin was the same person. They approached him, and they met their match; he led on the *Times* folk so that he got all sorts of promises, and when he finally declined to go to London the judges had him arrested and brought into court. There the whole hoax was disclosed, and, to add to the discomfiture of the *Times* and its partisans on the bench, Sir Charles Russell succeeded in preventing the *Times* from wriggling out of the matter.

When Molloy was called for the *Times* he had no evidence to give; but, on cross-examination by Michael Davitt, he stated that a solicitor's clerk in Dublin had promised him money if he would try to criminate Mr. Davitt either by true or false evidence.

Other witnesses were called, who swore that they knew of cases of boycotting and outrage. On being cross-examined they all testified that they knew of persons who had "written threatening letters to themselves," their object being to excite sympathy. The League, they said, denounced outrages, and was mainly instrumental in securing reductions in rent, which were very properly requested after the bad seasons of 1878 and 1879. These witnesses said it was their belief that if the reductions had been voluntarily granted the country would have remained peaceful.

The last two witnesses for the *Times*, examined on the eve and the day of adjourning the court till the 15th of January, turned out to be interesting specimens of the informer class, so that the Commission adjourned with an unfavorable outlook for the *Times*.

The first of these witnesses was a young man, evidently newly-clad, who gave his name as James Buckley, a laborer from Causeway, Tralee, formerly of the Kerry militia, transferred to the Middleboro regiment, from which he had been discharged, with a character which he swore was good, but which he had once destroyed. He testified to the *Times*' counsel that he had been sworn into the Fenian Brotherhood in 1880, and that all his brother Fenians belonged to the Land League. He told a queer story about a friend of his,

named Roche, who had been expelled from the League, and who had become a police spy. Buckley was one of two or three selected to kill Roche, whom he met soon after, at seven o'clock of a summer evening, a few hundred yards from the police barracks. He swore that he fired a revolver four times at Roche, but it missed fire. Three times he had fired while he held Roche by the coat. After this very palpable "outrage," Roche said to him in a friendly way: "Come over to the river till I put a bush in the gap." Roche afterward shouted "murder!" and went and gave information, and Buckley was arrested; but he had two men ready to swear an *alibi*; and, as he and Roche were at this time giving secret information to the police, the charge was not pressed and he was released, to become a close friend of Roche again. Though he was charged with attempted murder, he was released without trial or bail. On cross-examination this precious witness confessed that his character for veracity was bad, that he had been discharged from the militia with a character which he had destroyed, that he had been convicted at petty sessions in Ireland "four or five times," that he had broken open his mother's box and robbed her, and that his mother was now in the Listowel workhouse.

The last witness cross-examined before adjournment was an informer, named O'Connor, from Castleisland. This witness had told a strong and straight story for the *Times*, bearing hard on Mr. Timothy Harrington, M.P., who, he swore, had employed him and others in 1880 to go around by night and threaten voters to vote for the Nationalist candidate. On cross-examination, this witness confessed that he had been in the pay of the police since 1866, and that he had made a statement to a Government agent in Dublin, named Walker, "who pressed him rather hard, and asked him about Mr. Harrington." At this period of the cross-examination Sir Charles Russell handed the informer a letter, and asked him if he had written it. The color left the man's face as he looked at the letter, and in a low voice he admitted that it was his writing, addressed to his brother in Ireland. Sir Charles Russell then read the letter, as follows:

LONDON, 3d December, 1888.

DEAR PAT.: I am here in London since yesterday morning. I was in Dublin for two days. I got myself summoned for the *Times*. I thought I could make a few pounds in the transaction, but I find I cannot unless I would swear quare things. I am afraid they will send me to jail or at least give me nothing to carry me home. I would not bother with it at all, but my health was very bad when I was at home, and I thought I would take a short voyage and see a doctor at their expense (laughter), but instead of that doing me any good it has made me worse a little. I will be examined to-morrow, Tuesday, the 4th. Get some daily paper, the *Freeman*, and see how it will be on it. You need not mind replying to this, as I will leave this house as soon as I am examined, which won't be longer than to-morrow, Tuesday. Whatever way it will end do not blame me for it. I thought to do some good, but I fear I can-

not, but harm. Tell Martin to have thirty shillings out of the bank, as I fear I will have to send for the cost if he has got it. After the fair I may not need it, but I am afraid I may. I will write again to-morrow night, or at furthest on Wednesday, if I am alive and at liberty.

Your unfortunate brother,
THOMAS O'CONNOR.

This was the last word of testimony heard by the Parnell Commission before its adjournment in December, and it is typical. It shows the straits in which are the Government and the *Times* to connect the Irish leaders with the commission of outrage. A case that relies on such means is necessarily a weak and failing case; and though the inquiry is not yet over, from the past we may prejudge the future. Were there stronger witnesses to come hereafter, the *Times* would not have risked its case by using creatures like these in the early stages of the trial.

It will be said that these are only the weaker links of the chain, and this is true. But they are the only links presented to connect the Nationalists with the commission of crime. The stronger links are cases of utterly disassociated outrage, of agrarian and White-boy and personal offences, against which the National leaders have always warned the people.

During all the time of the trial, the coercion rule in Ireland has been applied with redoubled rigor. Half-a-score members of Parliament are either in prison or about to be tried for nominal breaches of the Coercion Law. On Christmas Eve, Mr. James J. O'Kelly, M.P., was released, after three months' imprisonment, and a week later Mr. Timothy Harrington, M.P., editor of the *Kerry Sentinel*, was sentenced to six months' imprisonment, "with hard labor," which specially condemns him to the performance of degrading offices, in association with criminal prisoners. On January 4th, this year, Mr. Finucane, M.P., was sentenced to a month's imprisonment; he was escorted to Castleconnell jail by the mayor and crowds of cheering people. William O'Brien, M.P., editor of *United Ireland*, was ordered to appear before the Parnell Commission on the 15th of January to receive sentence, for writing of the *Times* as the "Forger." To this summons Mr. O'Brien has replied in his paper:

"For speaking the truth fearlessly we have no contrition, but if the Attorney-General can suggest a line in our leader in which we have diverted from the strictest accuracy, we will tender an ample apology. Perhaps his sensitive soul was stirred by our allusion to his client as the 'Forger.' He really must make allowance for Press exigencies. We have used the name since the 'alleged *facsimile* letters' first appeared, and we will cease to use it only when they are proved genuine. If anything is likely to act as a deterrent on the 'Forger's' witnesses it is not our humble articles, but the scorching cross-examination of SIR CHARLES RUSSELL. Why don't they attach him for contempt?"

On the opening of the Commission on January 15th, Mr. O'Brien appeared in his own defence, and received only a warning for the future.

On January 24th, Mr. Wm. O'Brien appeared for trial on a charge of conspiracy, at Carrick-on-Suir, County Tipperary. The Government had issued a proclamation forbidding a demonstration; but 20,000 persons assembled to welcome Mr. O'Brien with cheers. The constabulary were ordered to charge the crowd, which they did with bayonets and clubs, wounding a great many. Mr. O'Brien was struck with a police rifle-stock, and Mr. T. M. Healy, M. P., was threatened with a bayonet at his breast.

Mr. O'Brien is also under summons to appear for trial at Kilarney on January 29th, on the charge of inducing tenants not to pay rents. Still another summons has been served on him, to appear for trial at Rathmore, on February 14th, on a similar charge. So that it will go hard with the three English judges and the stipendiary magistrates of Ireland, if they are not able to lock up for at least six months this outspoken and courageous editor and Member of Parliament.

Besides these charges and trials, other Irish members of Parliament have the cloud of the prison hanging over their heads. Mr. J. D. Sheahan, M. P., has been tried, but not sentenced, on account of ill health; and summonses and warrants have been issued for the following gentlemen since the first of January: Denis Kilbride, M. P.; James L. Carew, M. P.; John O'Conner, M. P.; Dr. Tanner, M. P.; and Mr. Condon, M. P. On the 23d of January, Mr. David Sheehy, M. P., who had made a speech for the Liberal candidate at Govan, where the Conservatives were signally defeated, was arrested under the Irish Coercion Act.

In every form of stricture, Coercion is at its highest point as the year 1889 opens. Evictions are proceeding with unexampled ferocity. The blind hope of the landlord party appears to be that, while they have the power in their hands, it is their best policy to sweep the people and their homes off the land, even if a desert is produced. It is the Cromwellian policy over again, with writs and crow-bar brigades instead of halts and slave-ships.

But banishment has turned out to be not a cure but a disease worse than the original. The wiser and more patriotic half of England acknowledges this, and is working to undo the evil. The cruel expatriation of the Irish people has filled the world with enemies, not only of aristocratic landlordism, but of the English power that supports the system. Ireland has won a lasting victory in proving to Liberal England that the Tories are not legislating for the empire, but for their own limited class and its privileges.

But even under the darkest cloud that Ireland has known since 1798, it is true and obvious that the unhappy nation stands in a more hopeful and advantageous position than it has ever occupied since the Norman invasion. For the first time in history there is a powerful English party with a national platform of Home Rule for Ireland. And this is no transient or personal movement, depending on one British leader. It is the formalized policy of the English Liberal party—a programme that is absolutely certain of fulfilment.

It is said by many, and hoped by the Tories, that the death of Mr. Gladstone or of Mr. Parnell would assuredly begin the decline of the Home Rule movement. The contrary is the safer prophecy. Though it is to be hoped that Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell will live to carry out the noble measure they have begun, it is certain now that the death of one, or even of both, would only remove from the Home Rule movement an element of personality, and leave it stronger than before. A reform is never at its full strength so long as it depends on one or two men, but when it has become part of the moral or common sense of the people.

From this standpoint, the Parnell Commission, with its incredible vileness in the witness-box, and its open partizanship on the bench; the widespread evictions and burning of peasant homes in Ireland; the jails filled with the honored representatives of the people; the influences of the Church implored to help the mailed hand of coercion—all these are signs favorable. They remove the Irish question from the care of party leaders, and place the responsibility on English conscience and civilization.

The patent evils of perjury, eviction, misery and unrest are the eruption of the disease of misgovernment that must be speedily cured, not by local repression, but by constitutional remedies.

Mr. Parnell himself, speaking on December 27th, after the adjournment of the Commission, summed up the proceedings in these words: "As to the general charges brought against our organization and movement, that is a matter of speculation, and, to some extent, of history, and a law-court is no more competent to decide it than anybody else. Up to the present, the *Times* has not got beyond a general description of the disturbed state of Ireland. Every attempt to connect, not us personally—for there hasn't been even an attempt to do that, except in the ridiculous story about Harrington told by an informer—but every attempt to connect our organization with crime, has completely broken down. As to the forged letters, let me confine myself strictly to the statement that we shall prove our case to the hilt."

Nothing could better close this article than the words that closed the year 1888 for Ireland from Pope Leo XIII., added to those

of Mr. Parnell. Here are the words of the Pope, addressed to the Irish people through the Archbishop of Dublin :

“ Whilst we embrace with a father's love every member of the fold of Christ, which He has entrusted to our keeping, our most special care, the first place in our thoughts is reserved for those whom we know to be sufferers from misfortune. For we are moved by that instinct which nature has implanted in the heart of every parent to love and cherish, beyond all the rest, those of their children who have been stricken by any calamity. For this reason, we have always held in a special feeling of affection the Catholics of Ireland, long and sorely tried by so many afflictions. And we have ever cherished them with a love all the more intense, for their marvellous fortitude under those sufferings and for their hereditary attachment to their religion, which no pressure of misfortune has ever been able to destroy or weaken.

“ As to the counsels that we have given them from time to time, and our recent decree, we were moved in these things not only by the consideration of what is conformable to truth and justice, but also by the desire of advancing your interests. For such is our affection for you that it does not suffer us to allow the cause in which Ireland is struggling to be weakened by the introduction of anything that could justly be brought in reproach against it.”

THE YEAR 1888—A RETROSPECT AND A PROSPECT.

HABITUAL introspection at the close of each day is strongly recommended by the Catholic Church as one of the most effective means for self-improvement. For each sunrise and each sunset implies for the individual a nearer and nearer approach to that last day on which the transitory earthly habitation will be left behind, and therewith the time ended during which it lies within our power to prepare ourselves for timeless eternity. The wisdom of this injunction is too apparent to require any elucidation. And in a similar sense, we take it, the larger life of nations, and the life of mankind as a whole, stand also in need of having *their* days from time to time carefully examined. What a day means for the individual, that a year may be said to mean in the life of a nation, and a still longer period, a century, in the life of the world.

There is much in the year 1888 that may escape superficial examination and yet forms the *raison d'être* why history will attach to it greater importance, not so much, however, in the outer, but rather in the inner, life of the civilized world.

During the last twelve months no great battles were fought, no war cast its gloom over Europe, no invention like that of steam or

electricity is to be recorded. But the series of events which took place impresses us deeply when we look below their surface and try to understand their significance for the future. Unless the "yes-terday" stands vividly before our eyes, how can we forecast the "to-morrow"? The Papal jubilee ushered in '88, an omen auspicious in itself. Death struck twice the ruler of Germany, while Austria and Greece celebrated the fortieth and twenty-fifth anniversaries of their respective rulers. In the United States the result of the election for President put again the Republican party into power. These events in themselves possess hardly enough intrinsic value to mark 1888 as a year memorable in the annals of history, since they register merely what might be called, not inappropriately, "family events," affecting the Catholics, affecting Germany, Austria, Greece and the United States, but not the civilized world at large. So, at least, the casual observer may hold; but how different he will judge when he analyses these seeming family events.

The Papal jubilee, as a feast, concerned, strictly speaking, only the Catholic world. For the fact that an old man who happens to sit in the chair of St. Peter celebrates the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood, is not in itself of any historical importance. Many priests all the world over do every year the same, and it remains a personal, a local affair. It is, of course, easy to understand that if that priest happens to be the Pope, the Catholic world seizes the opportunity to offer its congratulations to the head of the Church and give expression to its sense of filial attachment and loyal devotion. But the jubilee of Pope Leo XIII. meant more, much more. He is not only Pope, but he is also the prisoner in the Vatican; and yet, to pay homage to that prisoner, Protestant rulers, and even those outside the pale of Christianity, the Sultan, and the Shah of Persia, and the Emperor of China, vied with each other by personal letter and by costly gifts. Those prophets, therefore, who had predicted that the fall of Rome signified the end of the Papal power, were rudely shaken in their belief. The Papal jubilee was undeniably the occasion to show to an incredulous world that the Papal authority survived the loss of temporal power, and was still a universally recognized fact. It was seen that, instead of having sunk into the grave when Rome became the capital of the Italian Kingdom, the Papacy under Leo XIII. exercised a wide influence, wielded a vast power. Few of his most illustrious predecessors in the chair of St. Peter were as much the objects of honor and distinction by sovereigns and rulers all over the world as Leo XIII. The present ruler of Christendom combines, it is true, qualities in his person such as few men are endowed with. Rare intellectual gifts, and uncommon depth of learning, an unusually comprehensive statesmanship, a wisdom

and moderation as great as his piety and firmness, all helped to secure that tribute of recognition which the world never refuses to greatness. Yet it would be erroneous to believe that it was the person alone to whom the world hastened to express its deep sense of admiration; it was much more the office, the ruler of Christianity, the head of the Catholic world, that was honored. And therein, it seems to us, lies hidden a tacit acknowledgment that deserves to be weighed carefully.

Nor is this all. The Papal jubilee taught men still more. It demonstrated by irresistible facts the marvellous, though silent and unostentatious, growth of the Church and faithful allegiance and loyal devotion of the millions of children who look upon the Pope as their spiritual father; it showed the deathless Church marching onward and forward to victory on its mission of saving mankind. For months and months countless numbers of pilgrims went to the Eternal City to show that in every climate, in every nation, in every country there were subjects whose fervent adherence to the Bishop of Rome could not be doubted. The Vatican Exhibition undeceived men and furnished an evidence, more precious than the gifts it contained, that Christianity has an indwelling, indestructible power of expansion. If the past had not offered sufficient testimony that neither tyranny nor persecution, neither heresy nor schism, could shake the edifice built upon a rock, the present witnessed at all events that the Pope, even in prison, rules Catholicity, and without having lost influence, which the infallible head of an infallible creed must needs wield. The tie that binds head and members of the body Catholic together does not consist in the undisputed ownership of Rome; Italy perceived that the city on the Tiber is the Eternal City only because of the relationship of the Pope to it, deprived though he is of exercising his lawful rights over the same. The enemies of Christianity learnt that the Pope's voice is still the voice of authority, notwithstanding his confinement, and the obligation to obey it is not destroyed by his imprisonment. The anomalous position of the *one* sovereign who has subjects in every part of the world, and of every tongue and color, was in a singular manner illustrated also during 1888. The one great fact, then, which the past year forces upon our attention, lies in the general public recognition of the Catholic Church as the one religion possessing a vitality, a strength, a vigor which neither time abates nor adverse circumstances change.

The young German empire buried within three months no less than two emperors. The one, William I., who had led the united German forces from victory to victory and thereby cemented the nation into one great whole, who had been the instrument chosen by Providence to erect the new empire, who was allowed to out-

live the threescore and ten allotted to man, and who was at once a model of kingly dignity and modesty, was called away in February, and the whole nation in deep mourning followed his bier. Nor stood that grief long alone, for his son and successor, Frederic I., who was then already the sure victim of an incurable affliction and had undergone a terrible operation, so that death with him was but a question of time. Ninety-nine days after his father's death the son died, and so the two who had taken the most active part in fashioning the empire of Germany were both laid in the grave before spring's noontide. If the long life and venerable form and eventful career had endeared William I. to all German hearts, the manly fortitude and heroic suffering of Frederic I. touched their chords of sympathy and engraved the memory of his short reign in no less vivid characters upon the annals of German history. Grave were the misgivings entertained by the cabinets of Europe for the peace of Europe at the demise of William I., graver still when Frederic I.'s death was announced and the grandson who had buried two progenitors within so short a time assumed the reins of government as William II. Russia's attitude in the southeast of Europe, and the movement of military forces towards the Prussian and Austrian frontiers, was a menace to the peace of Europe. France, still unable to forget *l'année terrible*, conjured up another dark cloud on the political horizon. For, Boulanger's success might bring on a war, and if so no one could foresee what dimensions it would assume. The youthful emperor of Germany was, moreover, presumed to be full of a warlike spirit, and so uneasy apprehensions prevailed lest the drum should beat the alarum that would summon some twelve millions of men under arms and precipitate the Continent into a struggle which would raise hecatombs of men and leave countless widows and orphans to mourn for the bread-winners that fell on the battlefields. But that dread also, happily, passed away. Mindful of the bequest of grandfather and father, the young emperor dispelled the fears connected with his accession to the throne by a series of visits to St. Petersburg, Vienna and Rome which, while they threw out in bold relief the position accorded to Germany by all European powers, offered at the same time a guarantee that the triple alliance formed by Germany, Austria and Italy was no empty sound, and that whosoever ventured to disturb the internal development of the nations would be confronted by the combined forces, an encounter promising to be fraught with dire consequences for the disturber, in view of the numerical strength and discipline of the armies of the allied powers. The bonds of union between Prussia proper and the German rulers, as also with the northern kingdoms, Sweden and Norway and

Denmark, were solidified by William II. after his return from the visit to the Czar.

The one visit, however, which best bespeaks the attitude of the Protestant Emperor was his visit to the Pope. As guest of the King of Italy in the latter's capital, he could not drive in Italian court carriages to the Vatican to pay his respects to the Pope; for that might have been construed, with a good deal of semblance of truth, into an official recognition of the present status of the Papacy. Therefore a course was pursued that cannot be distorted into any such construction. All embassies are, as is well known, territories of the respective states whose ambassadors reside therein, and the German embassy at Rome is, of course, no exception in this respect. So the German Emperor drove from his own territory, viz., the German embassy, and not in carriages belonging to the king of Italy, but in his own court carriage, drawn by his own horses, all of which had for that express purpose been transported from Berlin to Rome, to the Vatican, and back from there again to the German embassy. The Liberal press tried hard to misrepresent this affair and give it a very different coloring, but the facts themselves do not warrant any other interpretation than this, that the German emperor, with a consideration equalled only by his tact, studiously and successfully avoided giving by his action any official approval, as it were, of the existing state of affairs regarding the Papacy. Add to this that, in order to silence the various rumors which some journals spread, the official organ of the Chancellor of the German empire wrote: "In Prussia the position of the Pope as the head of the Church, to which a good third of Prussian subjects belong, is officially recognized, and the Pope as the head of the Bishops forms part of our institutions." Thus it is patent that the enemies of the Church tried in vain to transmute the visit of William II. to Leo XIII. into an approval of the loss of temporal power. The youthful German emperor has no doubt disappointed the sanguine hopes of the enemies of Rome, as he likewise disappointed the enemies of peace.

Turning now to Austro-Hungary, the jubilee celebrated there derives much of its significance from a brief reflection upon the past. Austria has borne for 600 years the dignity and the heavy responsibility of the "Christian" empire and the obligation resulting therefrom to stand by the Church of Rome. Her rulers were the born protectors of Christianity and of the Christian social and political institutions. She is the *one* State in which the dignity of legitimacy, the "Kingdom by the grace of God," has been preserved, that is to say, the social kingdom as given by natural and revealed right; she is the one State which has not spent itself in the service of a socially and economically and religiously diseased

Liberalism; she it was that protected Catholicity against Protestantism in the Thirty Years' War; she stood up for Christianity against Islamism; she stood foremost and longest against the French conqueror. Napoleon's first defeat, at Aspern, Austria, unaided, administered, and at Leipzig, in the final struggle, her General commanded the allied forces. The monarchy, by the union of different nationalities under one head, was a political symbol of Christ's Church. The historic mission of Austria is its right of existence, and that mission consists now in reviving Christian principles in the life of the State, in cementing by unity of faith and Christian charity the nations together which nationalism misled and separated, in ousting Liberalism and replacing it by Christian socialism. Burdened at once with the cross and the imperial crown of thorns, Austria has followed the way of the cross through history. There has not been wanting in its life the Judas Iscariot of Liberalism and of Pessimism; but there has also never been wanting those who guided on the State with unchangeable loyalty and faith in its providential mission, and it was the present Emperor's fate to lead the people under his septre through many vicissitudes in a course which promises a social reconstruction on entirely Christian principles. The spirit of the age did not pass by Austria, but while it was able to taint, it was unable to corrupt the realm. In 1848, when the principles of 1789 moved like a hailstorm over middle Europe, Austria too had its revolution, and it was then that Francis Joseph, at the age of eighteen, had to ascend the throne and embark upon the difficult task of bringing order out of chaos. The Liberal ideas converted the Empire into a Constitutional Monarchy, but for the last eleven years the Government is again in the trustworthy hands of a Catholic Cabinet which proceeds on the right line. The form which the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of his reign assumed at the express wish of the emperor, illustrates best the principles that animate this benevolent ruler. Whatever the provinces, cities, towns, villages or private persons intended to do to commemorate the event should be devoted to charity and to the alleviation of suffering; that was his express wish. So the poor and the helpless, the orphan and the widow, the aged and the infirm, are the recipients of the gifts which royalty and personal attachment and veneration prompted all to lay at the emperor's feet. Hardly a day of the year 1888 passed without a notice in the press that here a blind asylum had its corner-stone laid, there a hospital, here a fund for the support of aged laborers been donated, there a house for the education of poor children established. His private charities, unknown to the public, reach far beyond the sum of which anything is known. Thus Austria has, indeed, very good reason to

pray to the Ruler above for a long life to its ruler, "by the grace of God," below.

The small kingdom of Greece, after having passed through many ordeals, recovers gradually from them under George I., whose twenty-fifth anniversary occurred in November, and offered a welcome occasion to the people and to all friendly powers to felicitate the king on his successful reign. The betrothal of his son, the heir to the throne, to the sister of the German emperor, augurs well for the future of that country. Of the other European states, little of moment, from a historical standpoint, is to be mentioned.

In Russia the Czar and his family had a narrow, almost miraculous, escape from a terrible railway accident, which may have contributed to bringing about a decidedly more pacific policy. The triple alliance rendered, of course, an indefinite postponement of any scheme of aggrandizement very desirable for the present. The decline of Pan-Slavism in Servia forebodes an era of peaceful development in that little kingdom, as well as in the neighboring Bulgaria, whose ruler, Prince Ferdinand of Coburg, though not officially recognized by the signatory powers of the treaty of Berlin, strives to develop the resources of the country and to improve its internal condition. The unhappy republic of France appears to drift along without knowing whither. The danger of a dictatorship under the would-be hero-general Boulanger was hardly averted by the ridicule which the issue of his duel with Floquet threw upon him, before he achieved fresh electoral triumphs, and again a revision of the constitution loomed up. What it may lead to nobody can foretell who knows the French character.

An event of far-reaching importance is, however, the result of the Presidential election in the United States. For the return into power of the Republican party at the expiration of President Cleveland's term of office means a radical change in the policy of the Government. Inasmuch as it is the mission of the United States to prove that Liberalism and Christianity do not exclude each other, it remains to be seen how far the admitted tendency of the Republican party will devote itself to a reform of the social order which, in the United States as well as in Europe, is much needed, and attracts already the undivided attention of the statesmen in the several European commonwealths.

This brief summary of the strictly speaking historical events of 1888 hardly furnishes material for singling it out as a memorable one in the history of the world. Deaths of rulers and anniversaries of rulers concern, as has been said, the respective nations rather than the world, and so likewise the change of party in the

great American republic. If we insist, nevertheless, that 1888 signalizes the beginning of a new epoch, the reason for it must lie of necessity outside the array of facts that stand forth as historical landmarks. And this, we contend, is precisely the case.

Whether it be due to the warning words uttered by Leo XIII. at the very beginning of his Pontificate, that a social crisis is near at hand and can be solved only by reintegrating the principles of Christianity into the life of the nations, or whether it be due to the overwhelming evidence of the necessity of doing something for a proletariat that increases at an alarming rate, matters little. The fact remains that a consciousness of a social disturbance has obtained general currency, and that it is felt that thorough-going reforms are needed for averting a serious calamity. For proof of this we have to turn simply to legislative measures, partly enacted, partly proposed, in nearly every Parliament, in order to perceive that a decided veering round from Liberal to the only sound Christian principles is noticeable. If not an open and outspoken return to Christian social principles, it is at any rate a tacit recognition of the social value of Christianity. Consequently, it seems to us that this year will some day be marked "Return to Christian Socialism," and therefore deserves to be looked upon as one of vital importance in the history of culture and progress.

The modern economic system, un-Christian in its essence, and more so still in its application, has wrought havoc in all countries, whether Catholic or not. No government escaped the scourge of Liberalism, and of what Liberalism necessarily entails, "capitalism." The social elements which Christian ethics has properly balanced were unhinged by the delusive promise that the larger share of liberty opened to all an equal chance to attain whatever happiness man can attain in this world. Religion, as a purely individual matter, was eliminated from the social order. After a lapse of forty years, since in 1848 the Liberal ideas obtained vogue with more or less intensity everywhere, the results of the Liberal economic and social system are before us, and in a transparent clearness which admits of no denial.

The common laborer, of course, felt first the effects, and hence the labor question, disturbed first of all the social order. It was found that the absolute freedom given him by Liberalism converted him into the absolute slave of the employer. But the labor question did not remain long alone. The agrarian question is now felt in the United States and in Europe alike. The farmer is unable to make both ends meet; the sale of his crops barely pays for the labor, and leaves him no profit. The burden of taxation grows heavier and heavier, and the peasantry groan under a load which has become unbearable. A fatal credit system, a no

less fatal right to divide and subdivide holdings, a reckless devastation of forests, and the like changes, impoverished gradually but surely the mainstay of all agricultural countries. At their expense the number and the wealth of the capitalists increased. The man who finds tilling the soil a road to the poorhouse abandons the plow and looks for employment in the city, and the steadily growing number of unemployed depresses in turn the price of labor, as is always the case when the supply exceeds the demand. Then there are the small trades-people. The master of the workshop, utterly unable to compete with the cheaper machine-made products of corporations, must, after a desperate struggle, close it, part with his independence and himself seek employment in the very factory that broke him up. He necessarily swells the number of the discontented. And even the small capitalist fares not much better. Against the big syndicate and money-institutions he has no power, and the process of absorption reduces him also in course of time to a salaried employee, a laborer after all. The big fish eat the little fish in the brook, in the lake, in the ocean; and so they do in social life. Productive labor has thus become everywhere the slave of capital's tyranny. That is the true statement of how society stands to-day. As the iron Chancellor strongly put it: "I will not see the aged laborer perish on the dunghill." It had come to that almost, and hence it was high time for inaugurating reforms.

The fact that nearly all civilized countries have enacted laws limiting the hours of labor, restricting the employment of children in factories, protecting women during the time of pregnancy, and that, moreover, the lines along which these measures move are not diverging, but converging, serves as a welcome sign that more correct ideas begin to supersede the notions of Liberalism on these points. The republic of Switzerland has, indeed, taken, the initiative to bring about, if possible, an international labor legislation. For, only uniform laws promise wholesome and lasting relief in times when a few hours' ride or a passage across the Atlantic can transfer the laborer from one country to another.

What underlies the labor question, underlies likewise all other problems. The highest law that should regulate the relations of man to man in the social order, is that of "justice," just as "charity" is the highest law in the moral order. That law of justice, as established by Christianity, has, to the detriment of mankind, been utterly wiped out by Liberalism. Applied to labor, it proclaims the principle that should equal the compensation paid for labor equal its value. This principle underlies the Christian idea of justice, and it certainly is plain and simple enough. But what business could continue to exist were it all at once introduced in

our day! So with the agrarian question, the small trades question, etc.; they all succumbed to the elimination of the law of Christian justice, which elimination has divided men practically into two classes, the oppressors and the oppressed.

The plutocracy, whose formation has been going on in every state during the last few decades, owes its origin and existence only to the extirpation of the Christian idea of justice from society, and has brought on that unnatural struggle after wealth as the "*summum bonum*," but which in the end proves destructive of the very basis of society. For, is it reasonable to be expected that the oppressors, growing fewer in proportion to the wealth amassed, can keep the oppressed, that large mass of discontented which intuitively have a sense of suffering from a social condition that is wrong, in a state of abject and inactive submission. The alternative consists either in a frantic outbreak which will override all laws and all institutions and wreck our civilization, or else in timely reforms on the one basis upon which Christian society has been erected.

Poor always did exist; they always will continue to exist as long as human beings people the globe. But "paupers" are a creation of Liberalism. We hear much about the energetic efforts on the part of Liberals to stave the tide of pauperism, but a few morsels of bread thrown to a hungry crowd do not appease its hunger. The modern Liberal searches diligently enough for the almost invisible bacillus, but fails to see that big worm "capitalism" that gnaws on the intestines of every nation. The anarchists and the bomb-throwers and the dynamiters talk one and the same language. The land doctrine of Henry George and the theories of Karl Marx have secured fanatical followers only because men driven nearly to despair cling to any promise of relief without weighing either soundness of doctrine or possibility of relief. Nor is it at all surprising to find an ignorant multitude unable to discriminate between what is right and just and what is wrong and unjust, when we reflect how the judgment of well-educated persons has been warped by the Liberal press. Newspapers are to-day a tremendous social power, and unfortunately the press, which is controlled, if not owned, by the capitalists, is permeated by the materialistic tendency of Liberalism, and hence is an instrument that has caused many erroneous opinions to be formed on living issues.

All the more, therefore, must we welcome the attention the intelligent public begins to pay to those men of heart and brain who devote their best energies to a social reform on the basis of true Christianity, a Baron Wambold, a Prince Lichtenstein, a Baron Vogelsang, the Dominican Father Albert Weiss, and others. They have done more to enlighten the world and bring about a proper understanding of the social crisis than those are willing to

concede who are beginning to incorporate their teachings in legislative measures. This nucleus of Catholics coming, as it does, more and more to the front, sheds a ray of bright hope over the darkened sky of society. The labors of these Christian social-politicians begin to bear fruit in the general awakening of the public to a realization that Christianity is as necessary to society as it is to the individual. Religion, it is seen at last, is more than a matter of the individual's conscience, and in proportion as this is understood, in the same proportion does religion as a social force, in fact the most powerful and influential social force.

And just here we encounter the solution of the apparent enigma, namely, a Liberal civilization, anti-Christian by necessity rather than by choice, paying an open and willing tribute to the enlightened occupant of St. Peter's chair. Men may be loth to acknowledge it, but they recognize by their actions that from that chair are spoken the only words of wisdom on the social situation. The refutation and condemnation of the erroneous doctrines of the day has neither been attempted nor carried out in any other quarter. Rome, and Rome alone, has pointed out that the fundamental laws of social existence have not been changed by steam and electricity and their application to the service of man; that we are still human beings with but a transitory home upon earth in order to prepare ourselves as creatures endowed with reason and free-will for our permanent home; and that hence no invention, no discovery, no philosophy can shake these primordial truths, nor what springs from them, so that the erection of a social order on any other basis contains within its own walls the guarantee of instability, and of sooner or later crumbling to pieces.

The sound sense of humanity revolts necessarily against the social monstrosity which Liberalism has built up, and the intense yearning of mankind to reach its destiny cannot be rooted out from the heart. The requirements of men as social beings are met by the Christian social order, and no other; co-existence and material pursuits are possible and conducive to earthly welfare only, if all differences are adjusted according to justice and equity and charity as declared and given by Christianity, and not according to human notions as to what these are.

The laying of a corner-stone of a Catholic university in the national capital of the United States possesses, in this connection, a deep meaning. It bespeaks the silent but progressive work of the Church; it announces her determination to prepare men fit to cope with the emergencies of the times; it tells us that the priest of the future will be equipped not only with the knowledge requisite for a proper discharge of those duties which the spiritual welfare of the souls entrusted to his care imposes upon him, but

also for those larger and wider duties which Christian socialism imposes upon him and adds on to his other functions. It is, in other words, a challenge and a prophecy : a challenge to imitate her who raises within cloister and seminary men devoted only to serve God through fellow-man, and equips them with the only weapon which defies destruction—truth. It is a prophecy in that the apostles of Christian socialism which the to-morrow will need, shall not be wanting. The reign of the almighty dollar may come to an end, the reign of justice never. How far will capitalism be ready to accord to the Catholic Church a voice in shaping the indispensable legislation on social matters? That, we take it, is the question of the future in the United States.

Some States in Europe have made their choice; they have chosen to prevent a social revolution that unquestionably would wreck the achievements of our civilization, by engrafting upon the present institutions the old ideas of the moral law, natural and revealed, as furnished by Christianity, and to establish thereby a historic continuity with the past. This is the manifesto of 1888 to the world; this the *raison d'être* of its being the dawn of a new day in the history of humanity's progress; this the meaning of the providential ordination that the jubilee of Rome's Vicar and the deaths of two great rulers should proclaim the perpetuity of Christ's Church on one hand, and the transitoriness of human greatness on the other; the firmness of the power of God, the weakness of even the greatest of men. 1888 bids us recognize that wherever "*convertere te ad dominum*" is understood by society, the bountiful blessings of divine mercy have not long to be waited for, and this return to social Christianity on the part of the State offers the guarantee that better days will await the generations who take the lessons of 1888 to heart and live up to what they enjoin.

What has been actually done towards a reorganization of society on Christian principles, consists in rudimentary beginnings only, whose main value lies principally in the recognition of the theory; but the better comprehension and the ardent zeal for a social reform is in the spirit of true Christianity that has risen to the surface and presages the deliverance of the people from the tyranny of Liberalism, capitalism and mammonism. The first centenary of the Revolution of 1889 will therefore witness the entombing of those ideas which then saw daylight, and the resurrection of those which, because divine, save society as they save men.

THE CANADIAN SEPARATE SCHOOL SYSTEM.

THE right which is enjoyed by Catholics, and by Protestants also, in parts of the Dominion of Canada respecting the appropriation of their own taxes to the support of their own schools, is a very important one and worthy of being well understood. It is a concession, a privilege, the dominant party may say; but the Catholics acknowledge it simply as a right, as a legislative sanction to the underlying principles of true education. They contend that the control of education cannot be rightfully divorced from the conscience of the parent; that the State with no conscience and with no conception of religion cannot undertake to impart religious instruction. A State School System, like an Established Church, has certain fascinations for the man in office as well as for the expectant politician; it affords him patronage, it offers him a chance to make a name for himself, and most of all it gives him a wonderful grip on the future generation. If to be the founder of a splendid State Church is likely now to be a dream of the past, there remains that appurtenance of it, a State School, which is hard to be relinquished. If we all cannot be expected to go to the National or State Church, we must be very narrow if we object to go to the National School. And so the energies of those who govern us, being diverted from the higher course, or what they deem the higher course, are the more strongly exerted towards that which remains. The State takes up education as the last stronghold of Cæsarism, and takes it up, at least in Canada, with a vengeance. Every one must be well educated in the arts and sciences; he must be enabled to enter the universities; he must learn an astonishing number of things whether or not they will ever be of the slightest use to him. The mind must be formed, the intellect must be trained. And so we have public schools, and high schools, and colleges, and universities, all, except a few struggling colleges, supported by the State, and presided over by a State official. The intellectual part of the youth being provided for, the moral training does not seem to be very important. It consists chiefly of inserting a few well-rounded platitudes—Pagan or Christian—wherever they could be conveniently worked in with the literary selections in the school books. But religious training is necessarily ignored. Some of the denominations, following the example of the Catholics, are striving to educate their own children in their own way; but their efforts are discountenanced and

they work under great disadvantages. The Juggernaut of the State rides over them. The State has money, and the appeal for general and higher educational facilities is one that is popular and patriotic. It is a drawing us out of the dark ages, it is enlightenment, it is the progress of the age. But there is no appeal for a higher or indeed any sort of religious training. The State itself, having no religion and naturally but a very heterogeneous conception of it, cannot be expected to teach religion any more than a joint-stock company could teach it. Its whole undisputed theology may be comprised in less than a page; and so it would not be worth while attempting to formulate any doctrine. A few, and these not "glittering generalities," must suffice. The Atheist and the Unitarian, the High-Churchman and the Methodist, the Ingersollite and the Catholic, may sit down at the common council of the nation and come to a conclusion as to the public works department or as to revenue, but they cannot make much headway with religious education, or even with highly diluted moral instruction in the schools. They wisely gave it up, protesting, however, that it is not essential; and even if it is, that it is sufficiently taught. At all events, whatever lack or deficiency there is in teaching the Divine science, there is a creditable overlap on the side of the human.

The writer is not concerned with the public or other State schools except in so far that they do not and cannot afford any guarantee to a parent of the religious instruction he may and ought to deem necessary for his child. The justness of this to all denominations was the origin of the Separate School System. That system is not, as is commonly supposed, even in Canada, an exclusive right or privilege for Catholics. It is extended to Protestants as well. There are separate schools for Protestants and for Catholics, making religious belief the line of separation; and separate schools for the colored people, making color the line of separation. The law is a little, but very little, in favor of the Catholic separate schools; as will be seen presently, the law inclines towards making public schools the vanishing point of Protestant separate schools. There are very few of these latter schools, for obvious reasons. It is rare that one form of Protestantism is so objectionable to another form as to superinduce an estrangement in the school-room; it is rather the fashion now in some parts of Canada for the different denominations to exchange pulpits on a Sunday. The week-day points of difference may be set down as a very slight divergence. This united front, or almost united front, of Protestantism, sufficed for the legislatures in times gone by to assume that there were only two religions so far as matters educational went; and they probably foresaw that it was a very poor specimen of a Prot-

estant that would not fall in one line where the Catholics were all on the opposite side.

And so, though it is convenient at times to rank Catholics with Methodists and Baptists and Anglicans and Presbyterians, as for instance, representatives in public offices and so on, yet in this matter of schools the population is to be regarded as Protestant and Catholic, and the legislation follows that supposition. Leaving out the colored schools as affording no special feature for our purpose, there are three sorts of elementary schools: The public school of no religion, the Catholic separate schools, and the Protestant separate schools for their churches respectively. The first of these is non-denominational, the other two are denominational by statute law.

The law as it now stands, for instance in the rather Protestant province of Ontario, is the result of a good many hard-fought battles in which it was difficult to avoid religious strife. It would be impossible to do more than sketch the history of it here, and even were it otherwise it is not a pleasant task. The reader will remember that when the French province of Quebec in the last half of the last century changed masters, a very small but important stream of immigration set in from Great Britain and Ireland. These were all Protestants, and belonged, of course, in those days, to the Established Church. They avoided the eastern province and generally came and settled in Western Canada, then a part of Quebec province. In 1791 the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain divided the old province of Quebec into Upper, or Western, and Lower, or Eastern Canada. This was opposed by the British emigrants, as it left some of them powerless among the French, and the remainder of them "hived" in Canada West. The provinces remained separated for fifty years, with a history enlivened by a couple of rebellions and an immense amount of petty tyranny. The British Act of 1791 (the Canada Bill) set apart one-seventh of all the public land for the support and maintenance of a Protestant clergy. This was the famous "Clergy Reserves," and was intended, no doubt, to be appropriated as endowments for rectories of the Church of England. These "Reserves" comprised about two millions of acres of the public domain of Upper Canada. In 1819 it was proposed to erect an Anglican rectory in every township; further instructions came about seven years later to the effect that these were to be endowed as soon as erected. The royal instructions on both of these occasions were disregarded, and things had come to such a pass in Church of England affairs that neither tithes could be collected nor rectories endowed in Canada at that time. All the other denominations were arrayed against the imperfectly established Church, but the Church of Scotland outstripped all

other opponents and proved in a legal way that she was as much a national Church as ever the Church of England had been. By a decision of the English Crown officers, the "Reserves" were declared to be equally the property of these two denominations. In the Act of Union between England and Scotland "the true Protestant religion" of the North Britons, though differing materially from the equally true Protestant religion of their southern neighbors, was "effectually and unalterably secured within the Kingdom of Scotland." So the Church of Scotland, being recognized at home, could not be set aside abroad where a slice of temporal lands was being distributed among "Protestant clergy." In every respect with the Church of England the Church of Rome was recognized before the law; but none of its adherents could fairly argue that its clergy should be regarded as Protestant. So they were shut out; and so also, in the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, were all dissenting ministers.

In 1831 the Imperial Government was obliged to declare its abandonment of the "Reserves," and in 1839 an Act was passed to distribute the proceeds of these lands among certain religious denominations. This Act was never put into operation. It was not till the year 1854 that the question was finally disposed of. A distribution among the different municipalities was then authorized. It can be well imagined that discussions might arise according as the municipalities proceeded to dispose of the money.¹ They could apply it only as they had authority to apply other moneys; and at a distance now of some thirty years it would be hard to say that any disposition could be free from objection.

The feeling engendered by these Reserves and their final destination might easily have produced denominational schools. The Canadas were in a sort of religious ferment for half a century. There were at least two hostile camps. As things subsided the Church of England lost her prestige and was obliged to sit down with the Dissenters, and with such National Churchmen as are to be found in the Kirks. Finally the natural and proper division came, and as the Catholics stood up on one side, the Church of England and the others all joined hands on the other. The question of separate schools was, however, agitated long before the "Reserves" difficulty had settled itself. In the year 1840 the Eastern and Western Provinces of Canada were united under one government. In population they were nearly even in point of numbers; one was British and Protestant, the other was Catholic and French. Responsible government, such as at present prevails in England, had

¹ See the controversy between the Chief Superintendent of Education and the Very Rev. (afterwards Mgr.) Bruyere on the appropriation of the Clergy Reserve Funds.

just been secured, and the people were in a fair way towards governing themselves. One of the first Acts of the year 1841 was a School Law by which in rural districts separate schools, for either Protestants or Catholics, could be established; in cities and towns a joint board of trustees was supposed to be able to manage educational affairs. During the succeeding ten years a number of legislative experiments were made; in 1843 the Act was repealed as to Western Canada, and four years later an unsatisfactory Act was passed which in its turn was superseded by an Act of the year 1849. This latter one was never put in force. A complete School Law was enacted in 1851, but it was not for two years afterwards that the basis of the present law was constructed, nor till the year 1855 that anything satisfactory was reached. In the general election of 1857 the propriety of having separate schools was one of the chief issues at the polls, and the result was that the Catholic party from Canada East was in a position to rule the House.¹

The Catholic Separate Schools in Western Canada numbered sixteen in the year 1851, increasing during the preceding decade from a solitary school in 1841 to the number mentioned. In the succeeding decade, or rather in 1862, there were 109 schools, with an attendance of 13,631 pupils. In 1863 the law was settled, such as with very slight modifications it exists at the present day. Under the Act of this latter year it was provided:

"Any number of persons, not less than five, being heads of families, and freeholders or householders, resident without any school section of any township, incorporated village, or town, or within any ward of any city or town, and being Roman Catholics, may convene a public meeting of persons desiring to establish a separate school for Roman Catholics, in such school section or ward, for the election of trustees for the management of the same."

The trustees so elected formed a body corporate, and had power to enforce and collect rates and contributions towards the support of the school, and they had and have all other necessary powers in that regard.

The Protestant and colored separate schools are now brought into existence in this way:

"Upon the application in writing of five or more heads of families resident in any township, city, town, or incorporated village, being Protestants, the Municipal Council of the said township, or the Board of School Trustees of any such city, town, or incorporated village, shall authorize the establishment therein of one or more separate schools for Protestants; . . . and in every such case, such council or board, as the case may be, shall prescribe the limits of the section or sections of such schools."²

¹ Thomas D'Arcy M'Gee was returned at this election.

² Originally, in regard to these schools, it was necessary that there should be twelve applicants, but the law has very recently been changed. There are only half a dozen of Protestant separate schools in Ontario to-day.

The chief point of difference in the Protestant and Catholic schools is that in regard to the former there is this clause :

"No Protestant separate school shall be allowed in any school section, except when the teacher of the public school in such section is a Roman Catholic."

There is no corresponding clause to this in the Act as regards the Catholic schools. The supporters of the schools have to reside within a radius of three miles from the site of the school-house, otherwise, if not so situated, they can attend the public schools. So long as the separate schools exist they must be supported by those desiring to support them, but a Catholic can withdraw his support and allow his taxes to fall into the public schools.

The protection which the Separate School Act affords is of two kinds : it exempts from the public school tax and it secures a share of the public school fund. This is provided for by two sections :

"Every person paying rates, whether as proprietor or tenant, who, by himself or his agent, on or before the first day of March in any year, gives to the clerk of the municipality notice in writing that he is a Roman Catholic, and supporter of a separate school situated in the said municipality, or in a municipality contiguous thereto, shall be exempted from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of public schools, and of public school libraries, or for the purchase of land or erection of buildings for public school purposes, within the city, town, incorporated village, or section, in which he resides, for the then current year, and every subsequent year thereafter, while he continues a supporter of a separate school ; and such notice shall not be required to be renewed annually."

The share of the public monies devoted to education is reached in this way :

"Every separate school shall be entitled to a share in the fund annually granted by the Legislature of this Province for the support of public schools, and shall be entitled also to a share in all other public grants, investments and allotments for public school purposes now made or hereafter to be made by the Province or the municipal authorities, according to the average number of pupils attending such school during the twelve next preceding months, or during the number of months which may have elapsed from the establishment of a new separate school, as compared with the whole average number of pupils attending school in the same city, town, village, or township."—26 V., c. 5, s. 20.

Taking the Province of Ontario as a fair example of the working of a denominational elementary school system, a few statistics may be of some value. In round numbers the entire population is 2,000,000; the population between the ages of five and sixteen 500,000.¹ The grand total of schools of every description reaches

¹ The exact figures in the last census were 1,913,460 as the entire population, with 489,924 of school age. Of these 85,000 were the estimated number of Catholics.

about 5300, and of this number 200 are Roman Catholic separate schools. The entire Catholic population is between one-fifth and one-sixth of the whole, and the school children upwards of 90,000. It may seem extraordinary that there are not 800 or 900 schools for them, but the reason is obvious enough. In the report of separate schools in the year 1881 the Government Inspector, Mr. J. F. White, says :

"In school are laid, in great part, the first principles of the child's future conduct, and its will, heart, conscience, and whole character formed. There it is taught its duties, of which, as all Christians are agreed, the moral and religious are the most important. Catholics think, further, that religion, to be solid and effective, must be instilled throughout the child's entire education. Therefore, content with no mere secular instruction, and believing that education without religion is impossible, they asked for and obtained separate schools in which to give their children a religious training. In many instances they have not taken advantage of the privilege thus conferred. Frequently, where the Catholic ratepayers are greater than, or equal in number to, the other supporters, no effort has been made to separate. Again, in places where nearly all the population is Catholic, as in French, and some German, settlements, there exists no need for such schools. It thus happens that most of the Catholic children of the Province receive their training in public schools. That many of the latter are, in their character, as distinctively Catholic as separate schools is shown by the establishment, in some sections, of Protestant separate schools

"The trustees' returns of school population show that there are 484,224 children of school age. Of these, according to the ratio of population, at least 85,000 are Catholics. By the report for the present year, the number attending separate schools is 24,767. Allow for 2000 at colleges, private schools, etc., and for non-attendance at any school 2 per cent. of the total school population, the remainder, 56,533 (two-thirds), is in attendance at public schools. It must be remembered that about 30,000 of these attend school in Catholic settlements."

In the Educational Report for Ontario for the year 1888 the progress of the Catholic separate schools for the preceding ten years is given. The schools increased 57 in eleven years, and the number of teachers from 302 to 461. The Minister of Education, commenting on the general advancement, says: "It will be seen that the separate schools are steadily prospering, and that both as regards teachers and pupils they are becoming more efficient every year."

Speaking of the quality of education imparted, Mr. White says :

"The work of the separate schools is much the same in character as that done in public schools. Frequently it is assumed that the education given in the former is, of necessity, inferior to that imparted in other institutions. Facts, however, will not bear out this assumption. It is not to be supposed that a poor and sparsely attended school will bear comparison, as to its results, with a wealthy school having a large attendance. But, where the conditions have been at all equal for the two systems, separate schools show results in no way inferior to those of the public schools. The mark of inferiority cannot be attached to such schools as have, year after year, passed pupils for second and third class certificates, and whose work, in a few cases, compares favorably with that of some high schools."

The cost of pupils to the rate-payer is shown to be less, and generally a good deal less, to the separate than to the public school supporter. Here is the cost per pupil for the year referred to :

	Counties.	Cities.	Towns.
Public schools,	\$5.70	\$9 30	\$6.20
Separate schools,	4.70	4.78	5.66

It will be seen from this that, while in rural sections the cost per pupil is much the same, in the cities, where the religious orders do the work, the expenses are kept nearly one-half lower than in the public schools. Out of a total number of 451 teachers, 248 belonged to religious communities.

The Catholic children of the Province have an opportunity in all cases of going to their own schools, and if their fathers and guardians do not see fit to separate in particular localities, it is because they can do as well without a separation. It is obvious that, in a Catholic settlement with, say, half a dozen Protestant neighbors, it would be a disagreeable proceeding to erect a school which would deprive these half dozen of any sort of school, and would be controlled exactly the same as if there were no such thing as separate education. Accordingly in settlements where the Catholics can control the school, no matter what it may be called, they allow it to remain open to the minority by retaining it as a public school. Where in thinly settled districts it is a hard matter to maintain one school efficiently, it is often a subject of serious deliberation to both pastor and people whether a separation is or is not for their own good. In cities and towns good separate schools can almost always be counted on ; in villages and in rural districts the chances are the other way. If you have a thrifty, compact settlement, you can have a flourishing school anywhere ; it goes without saying that you must have substantial ratepayers within a reasonable radius before you can attempt a separate school.

In Ontario the Separate School system extends, practically, only to elementary schools. There are no Separate High Schools, no Separate Collegiate Institutes, no Separate Colleges, endowed by the people. There is a separation in the primary schools, but if a pupil wishes to get a higher school education, he must, generally, fall in with the National system. The High Schools receive very substantial support from the Government, and they can count on local support, public and private. The Provincial University is the culmination of these schools and colleges, but there are many other universities, though chiefly of a denominational character. The Education Department has no control over these, but it controls and supports the Provincial University, and the general school system, public and separate.

The supervision which the Educational Department has a right to direct over separate schools is of a very negative character. The Chief Superintendent, or the Minister, is compelled to acknowledge them, but he does very little besides. The regulations which can be prescribed are not of a very vital character; indeed, the Legislature itself is precluded from prejudicially affecting the school law. Separate schools existed for a good many years prior to the Confederation in 1867. In that year four of the British Provinces cast in their lot together as a small Federal Union somewhat in the nature of the American Union. Two of them, the Canadas, had separate or denominational schools, and the Catholic delegates at the Conference for the Union looked after the Catholic minority in Western Canada, whilst the Protestant delegates were equally anxious for the Protestants living among the French Canadians. The result was, both minorities were protected against future invasion of their school laws. The Act which united the Canadas and the other two Provinces was an Imperial Act,¹ and its guarantees cannot be disturbed unless by a repealing Act of the Imperial Parliament.

The clause in the Imperial Act is as follows:

93. In and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to Education, subject and according to the following provisions:

(1.) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the Province of the Union. [1867.]

(2.) All the powers, privileges and duties at the Union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects shall be and the same are hereby extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects in Quebec.

(3.) Where in any Province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the Province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any Act or decision of any Provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to Education.

(4.) In case any such Provincial law as from time to time seems to the Governor-General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor-General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper Provincial authority in that behalf, then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section and of any decision of the Governor-General in Council under this section.

It will be seen from this how safe the Separate School Law is from any local encroachment.² It stands with the Canadian Constitu-

¹ 30 and 31 Vic., cap. 3.

² Ordinarily in Canada if a Provincial Act is beyond the competency of its Legislature, or *ultra vires*, it is vetoed by the Central Government at Ottawa; but if such Act refer to these schools, it is not disallowed in that way, but is dealt with as an appeal

tion, but it may fall with it. It is unaffected by local agitation or by local legislation in the Province, though it may be, and has been, amended at the instance of the proper authorities. Being a law for a "denomination," to use the word of the statute, no government would proceed to enact any amendment to it unless at the request of the heads of that denomination. This secures the law from any hasty or ill-considered changes, and leaves to the ecclesiastical authorities the proper guidance in educational affairs.



THE SO-CALLED PROBLEM OF EVIL—A PROTEST.

"It is a most salutary thing, under this temptation to self-conceit, to be reminded that in all the highest qualifications of human excellence we have been far outdone by men who lived centuries ago."—CARD. NEWMAN.

"Vielen gefallen ist schlimm."—SCHILLER.

IT may sound a little cruel, but there is no answer more effective and oftentimes more truly kind than to beg a too voluble questioner to state his difficulty. It is a veritable red rag to him. Has he not been stating his difficulty for the last half hour? and now he is coolly requested, not to restate it—that might be construed as a compliment—but simply to make himself intelligible. "Where's your difficulty?" is one of the most exasperating things that can be said, especially when accompanied with a certain inflection of voice. For the moment the position of the person consulted is forgotten in the greatness of the snub. Resentment blinds us to the reasonableness of his request; and even though light were given us to see this much, it is doubtful whether our will would comply. Some, indeed, try to seem at their ease and laugh it off, but a tell-tale flush overspreads their face, and in the look with which they regard the ancient man, those qualities of reverence and love so much recommended to youth are conspicuously absent. If wise and sufficiently heroic, the young man will pause a moment to rally from the rebuff, but if neither wise nor heroic, his alleged difficulty will be reiterated with the added

to the Governor-General. The difference may be important in one respect, as the parties affected could be heard on the appeal; the disallowance is a ministerial act of the Privy Council of Canada, and is done in the secret way in which all such acts are conducted.

velocity and lessened lucidity due to vexation, and the old man must continue to listen, though still unable to follow.

There is another form of trial to which a youth with difficulties is liable. He may have worked very hard at some problem and come to the conclusion that it is insoluble, a very satisfactory conclusion at times to come to. It is a mistake to suppose that the mind can find gratification only in the discovery of the powers it possesses. Now-a-days at least, men grow almost hilarious over the discovery of their incapacity for truth. They are delighted to prove to themselves and others that all of us are very small indeed. They grow wroth over the old Ptolemaic system, were it only because it unduly exalted man's position in the physical world.¹ In their self-depreciation they turn admiringly to physical law and offer it a place above the thing called mind, which they regard suspiciously and praise grudgingly. They love darkness and the lowest place, and are proud to admit that they are in it. Into the causes of this strange parody of humility we cannot now enter. We only observe in passing the curious fact that never before in the history of the world was man made so much of as the centre of the universe of God.² Our student, then, with the problem is in the above happy frame of mind. He has found the insoluble something that baffles his mind, and therefore the minds of all men, and so far he is satisfied. For such a one there may be a terrible shock in store. If the grave old man of our first parable be consulted, it is just possible that he will remark: "Of course it can be solved. It has been solved scores of times. Let me show you." The words may be spoken innocently, but they rankle deeply. The slightest discoverer, if he be attached to his own opinion, as some discoverers are, will reason somewhat after this fashion: My mind has been given to that problem as no other mind ever was. I have pronounced it to be insoluble. It *is* insoluble, and no one has a right to imagine that he or anybody else has solved it. Don't tell me the thing has been done. It never was and never can be.

This picture may give some idea of the reluctance with which we approach one of the so-called insoluble problems. One is pretty sure to give offence by calling it comparatively easy, or even by hinting that it is in a very great measure solved. Yet with all the good will in the world, we cannot but think that it is so. In the face of the irresistible force of the reasoning of a St. Augustine and a St. Thomas, it would be the merest hypocrisy to acquiesce in the epi-

¹ Man's place in the physical world is treated by St. Thomas in the spirit of the true Rationalist. "Multo plus excedit *Anima Rationalis* corpora cœlestia quam ipsa excedunt corpus humanum. Unde non est inconveniens si corpora cœlestia propter hominem esse facta dicantur, non tamen sicut propter principalem finem." *Suppl. ad Summam, Quest. 91, 3.*

² For a lamentable proof of this, see Archdeacon Farrar's work, *Eternal Hope*.

thets that are designed to convey the stupendousness and insolubility of the problem. It may be so in a sense not at all contemplated by the users of these big words—this sense we may have to consider later—but in the meaning intended by modern writers it is neither stupendous nor insoluble. What Dr. Martineau says of the youths who, thanks to Darwin, are not going to be caught in the trap of “Final Causes,” and must have their fling at Paley and the Bridgewater treatises, we may be permitted to say in an applied form of most of those who bandy about the phrase, the Problem of Evil. Dr. Martineau writes (“A Study of Religion.” Preface):¹ “It is probable that of those who speak in this way nine out of ten have never read the books with which they deal so flippantly.” We, on the other hand, shall not be far below the mark if we put the proportion of those who have any clear understanding of the real meaning of the hackneyed phrase, problem of evil, at one in a thousand. One book, which will have to be mentioned again, has just been published, bearing that very name. The author, Mr. Greenleaf Thompson, might as well have called it “Problems in Mechanics” for all the relevancy of the argument. Early in the book (p. 26) he says the problem is quite insoluble, and abandons the attempt accordingly. Yet the book goes on for 250 pages more. The two Mills² were too overcome by their aimless indignation against an imaginary God to bequeath us any contributions of value on the subject of evil, physical or moral, and the literary sentimentality of Archdeacon Farrar is equally barren of results.³

¹ Probably nowhere in the whole range of English philosophy will be found such a masterly solution of some modern difficulties concerning evil as in the pages of Dr. Martineau (*Ibid.*, vol. 2, c. 3). We had intended giving some extracts, but it would be difficult to make a selection from a chapter which, for a combination of subtlety of thought, brilliancy of diction and playful fancy, is one of the masterpieces of recent literature. The author unconsciously, it would seem, applies many principles of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, and thus adds vastly to their practical force. A study of these principles, coupled with an application of them under the able guidance of Dr. Martineau, will be found to fortify the true philosophy of evil against any possible attack. We may add that Dr. Martineau strongly deprecates the passionate and foolish spirit in which the problem is so often approached.

Like Dugald Stewart, he is quite ready to admit that the problem is by no means as difficult as it is represented.

One slightly adverse criticism may be offered. The large space devoted by Dr. Martineau to the treatment of animal pain seems altogether disproportionate. However, it may be said that modern Humanitarianism rendered it necessary.

² *Autobiography of J. S. Mill*, p. 41.

³ In *Eternal Hope*, Sermon 3, Archdeacon Farrar, evidently under the influence of excitement, which seems not to have subsided between the preaching of the sermon and the publication of the book, thus expresses himself: “St. Thomas lent his saintly name to what I can only call the abominable fancy,” etc., etc. Neither St. Thomas’s saintliness nor fancy is here in the least concerned, only his logic. His particular

A famous stanza of Tennyson's is perhaps the very best illustration of the wild obscurity with which modern philosophy has surrounded this question as though to make examination impossible. Compressed into four lines by the poet's marvellous power, the very essence of modern thought on a momentous subject stands revealed. Words like these have probably done as much to foster a false philosophy of evil as Shakespeare's plea for the beetle and its pangs has done for a false Humanitarianism :

[He] thought that God was love indeed,
And love Creation's only law,
While Nature, red in tooth and claw
With ravin, shrieked against his creed.

A few remarks on this may be subjoined.

There is a voice heard above the shriek of Lord Tennyson's Nature—for we cannot believe that it is Nature herself, so sweet and stately—and that is the loud protest of the Philosophy of Religion and Common Sense.

Compare the poet of the 103d Psalm and judge, not only whose is the saner philosophy, but whose the truer art. "Thou waterest the hills from thy upper rooms, the earth shall be filled with the fruit of thy words, bringing forth grass for cattle and herb for the service of man, that thou mayest bring bread out of the earth and that wine may cheer the heart of man. . . . Thou hast appointed darkness and it is night; in it shall all the bears of the forest roam, young lions roaring after their prey and *seeking their meat from God.*"

And next hear Common Sense. "The life of the lion," says St. Thomas in his robust way, "could not be preserved but by the killing of the ass" (*Summa*, Pars i., 48, 2); and again: "Some would say that the nature of fire was bad, because it burned the house of some poor man." This strange opinion, as he calls it, he attributes to the "Ancients," "because they did not consider universal causes, but only particular causes of particular events" (*Ibid.*, Pars i., 49, 2).

The whirligig of time, indeed, brings round its revenges, and Lord Tennyson, the representative of our highly-evolved selves, must be classed under the now slightly opprobrious name of "Ancients."

conclusion about lost souls is infallibly deduced from premises which Archdeacon Farrar himself must grant.

Mr. Leckey's mode of attack on the same passage is—

(1) To quote only two lines.

(2) To mutilate these two lines.

(3) To print five words of these two mutilated lines in capitals of horror (*Hist. Rationalism*, 2d ed., vol. i., p. 350).

Another, perhaps it might be called a lower, form of common sense has still to make its reckoning with Lord Tennyson. It asks: Do you or do you not do wrong in ordering a red-handed butcher to kill your meat? Do you not make Nature shriek? We think that nature (with a small n) would shriek louder if the "bleeding business" were *not* done.

But it is not from writers of books or poetry that the modern spirit is best caught. The heterogeneous mass of literature that is ever falling from a glutted press on a glutted world is better for the purpose. It is from newspapers and periodicals, supplemented by the information gained from odds and ends of discussion, shakes of the head, smiles of disbelief and sighs over life, that we come to form a very true estimate of popular views of evil. Judging by these criteria, the demand for articles that can in some way or another be called problems, with a dash of evil in them, is going briskly on. To minds capable of anything like ultimate analysis, they are reducible to a very few—witness the ceaseless and wholly unnecessary multiplication of so-called religious problems—but the multifarious ways of describing them, and the colors in which modern literature revels, give them an air of reality to which they have no intrinsic title.

All the metaphorical resources of the English language—that most untruthful instrument of the most truthful race under the sun—are exhausted in the attempt to portray the strange manners and customs of problems. We have Problems Religious, Philosophical, Scientific, Social, Economic, and, dreadful to say, Comic or Comical Problems; Problems that confront us like sturdy beggars—Problems that demand solution, that menace, that haunt, that bewilder, that overpower, that make life unendurable (so it is said), that assume every shape and form and monstrous feature, perplexing, importunate, complicated, hopeless, insoluble Problems—and the greatest of them all is Evil.

There is a language of problems growing up apace, and lamentations over the "hideous enigmas" of life bid fair to generate a literary screaminess and philosophical slang. After all, apart from shams and phrases, the world is luminous still, with the simplicity and symmetry of God's handiwork. The darkness over it is but necessary and bountiful; it is necessary as the consequence of our limited being. Were the world all light to us, the world were miserably little. And the darkness is bountiful as the occasion of the nobility of self-surrender, the heroism of suffering and the divinity of compassion. Hideousness there is, but this is not part of the darkness; it is part of the very distinct and palpable reality of human sin. Wild invective confounds this harmless darkness with this hideous sin, until the world begins to think

itself grievously ill-used at the hands of God. At this point undisciplined speculation and unchastened language rush blindly in, and thrust aside the realities of life, and the world becomes far more unhappy because of its man-made theories than because of its God-made facts.

After such a Babel, no wonder that the tones from the past are welcome, for they are low and mellow and sweet to the jangling that vexes ear and spirit, but they are too gentle to drown it, and Shakespeare may sing and St. Thomas teach unheard:

"There is a soul of goodness in things evil,
Would man observingly distil it out."

"Respondeo dicendum quod malum non potest esse nisi in bono. . . . Respondeo dicendum quod causa mali est bonum. . . . Respondeo dicendum quod Deus causando bonum ordinis universi, ex consequenti et quasi per accidens¹ causat corruptiones rerum."²

We fail, as we said, to sympathize with the language used about this so-called terrible problem. It sounds, in too many cases, loose, extravagant and hollow. The questions, Where is your difficulty? Has it not been in great measure solved? rise to one's lips. We know, of course, the penalty that is attached to the utterance of an opinion somewhat adverse to the age's idea of itself. The gently abusive powers of modern English—one would rather fall under the good old knock-him-on-the-head style of criticism—are put in requisition against the man who cannot feel, as it is said, with the age. He is out of touch with the modern spirit, incapable of seeing two sides to a question, blind to the signs of the times, deaf to the cry of struggling humanity, his altruistic growth stunted, and one side of his nature uncultivated. Alas, alas! Why will not these accusers, replete with these phrases and flouts, "deafened with the clamor of their own dear groans," remember that we are debtors not only to the generation in which we live, but also to the minds of the thinkers of old? We have obligations to both. We are not free to treat the dead ill because they will not feel it. They indeed are beyond the reach of injustice and the chill of neglect, and it is well; for there where they fought on the sacred battlefield of truth, a noisy crowd of gasconaders and philosophers is swarming, at one moment glorying over their comparatively petty conquests—those over matter—at the next cowering before shadowy armies of mental problems, inviting them to approach, then growing hysterical, turning and flying, contemptuously ignorant of the deeds of those who stood there once, not

¹ Aristotle's *κατὰ συμβεβηκός*. English helpless here. Perhaps *primarily unintentioned* gives something of the idea.

² *Summa*, I. c., and the *Quæstio de Malo* among the *Quæstiones Disputatæ*.

humble or wise enough to go to Augustine's "Confessions," that miracle of thought and tears, and cry out with him, "Quærebam unde malum et male quærebam,"¹ but supremely satisfied with themselves, insensible to the influence and uninspired by the voices of the mighty past. The clear and fearless gaze that in the old days of the combat of thought used to dispel the gloom is growing dim, and the strong grasp that once wrung its worst terrors from mystery is relaxed. "We have lost something in our progress," are the closing words of Mr. Lecky's great work, but they are not sad enough. We have lost the great bulk of the science of life, philosophy.

And there would seem to be little prospect in our days of any general effort to recover lost ground, or of anything like a successful solution of even an ordinary philosophical problem. In a progressive age we make no progress in philosophy.

It will be enough to give only one reason out of many for this rather gloomy view. It may be stated thus: Protracted logical reasoning and deep disciplined thought have become to the modern mind almost a physical impossibility, or at least our repugnance to such processes is almost insuperable.

This reason will seem a matter of rejoicing to those who derive their ideas of the logical characteristics of the old philosophy from writers who, to the delight of the vulgar taste, persist in identifying logic with verbal jugglery. Taken in this sense, logic, of course, connotes a low condition of intellect; and in this same sense many pages out of the old philosophers may be said to be disfigured. But such a state of things never was the rule in the great authors, but the exception. As well might one say that the average of Stoic teaching was fairly represented by a syllogism once discussed in their schools: You have that which you have not lost. But you have not lost horns. Therefore, you have horns. The staple of the great Christian peripatetics was sound and solid thought. The subject-matter of the thought may or may not commend itself to modern ideas, and we are far from saying that it would be desirable for us to devote our thought to exactly the same points. That is not the question. The question is: Was there immense power of thought in these men, and if so, do we bestow on the subject-matter that *we* prefer any thought like it? Do we? For some such thought, it must be borne in mind, is necessary for the attainment of any philosophical truth. To this question it is hardly necessary to say that no answer can be returned, unless the answerer has read something of the two schools which he proposes to compare. With this proviso, there

¹ As a Manichæan. Confessions vii. 5.

can be no manner of doubt as to the result of the contrast. It would be well if, instead of dwelling on the remarkable facility we undoubtedly possess of transporting ourselves to ages long dead and of feeling to a great extent with them, we should sometimes vary the process and call these other ages from the tomb and bid them live with and remark on us. We think, for instance, a resuscitated St. Thomas would soon master many modern problems, and at the sight of our decadence in the reasoning powers that he once found and stimulated in the educational centres of Europe, we doubt not that he would stand aghast. There is no other word for it.

Suppose he were told that eminent men of the nineteenth century expressed in print their doubts as to the sum of $2 + 2$ in another planet, how should he not feel aghast? And in so feeling, would he be right or would he be wrong? Is it by reason of the prejudices of his old-world education, or because of his insight into everlasting truth, that the mediæval philosopher would be thus very literally shocked? The question must be capable of an answer.

Or let him be informed that the immense progress of science, of which we are justly proud, is stated on many hands to have necessarily impaired belief in the very existence of God—for, stripped of all ambiguities, this *is* the naked assertion of multitudes. He would probably rather disbelieve his informant than imagine for a moment that the educated and cultured human mind could possibly have fallen so low. Even when he came to realize it, how could he, by dint of strict reasoning, argue the world into reason again? He could not, for strict argument, to be efficacious, supposes a considerable amount of pre-existent reasonableness. All he could do would be to suggest some simile or metaphor suited to the tastes and capacities of the age. He might observe, for instance, that though the childish idea was exploded, that the noise in the sea-shell held close to the ear was the distant roar of the sea, still the existence of the sea was not thereby imperilled, nor the necessity of its waters for the life of fish lessened. Neither was God's existence made more doubtful, no matter what the discovery that falsified old unscientific notions on any physical fact in the whole physical word; nor was the necessity of His existence as the ultimate explanation of all life and being diminished.

This is all, perhaps, that even St. Thomas could do.

The higher processes of thought—let us call them by their right name, the metaphysical—are closed against him, owing to the mental conditions of his hearers. For the solution of strictly philosophical problems it seems to me that the modern mind is as ill-fitted as the mind of any previous epoch ever was, while, com-

pared with several ages of the past, which we are ignorant enough to decry or presumptuous enough to patronize, we aptly illustrate on these points the second childhood of the world. Over and over again, we honestly fail to see in pretentious books the veriest sophisms that ever were penned—*φανερώτατα ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡμῖν*.¹ One would think that we were incapable of taking the two or three steps that would often be sufficient to lead us to first principles. Mr. Lecky, for instance, the very highest type we possess of a philosophical historian and masterly writer, has repeatedly stated, both in his *Rationalism* and *European Morals*, that the general disbelief in miracles is not founded on reason, and yet is the right and proper attitude to assume. He does not see the fatal blow he is inflicting on the fundamental truths of true Rationalism. As a more general experiment, take any long chapter in a modern book on philosophy, and having extracted the gist of the reasoning, submit it to that most crucial test, syllogistic form. Two results will be observed. First, the precipitate of reasoning thus obtained will, as a rule, be in infinitesimal proportion to the amount of verbiage that has been evaporated; and, secondly, it will often enough be frail and worthless, incapable of standing the test of light, still less of handling. To exist at all, it must be put back into its wordy and deceptive covering. Let the same experiment be tried, say with Suarez against James I.,² and his one page will yield more solid produce of reason than the whole bulk of the other book. He professes to reason and does reason, and if he reasons falsely, he can be detected; the other professes to reason and does not, but it is hard to discover that he does not.

Yet there would seem to be some hesitation in admitting that we do not excel in reasoning powers. This is due to the fact that we have no standard of reasoning to which we compare ourselves. Hence we do not humble ourselves enough. Worse than this, no one will do it for us. In other words, there is no such thing in our day as philosophical criticism of philosophy—an extraordinary paradox, to be sure, to those who believe that the highly intelligent criticism which marks the literature, science and art of the century extends to the whole field of thought. However, it takes no profound knowledge of ancient and modern philosophy to be able to say that, considering the masterly anatomy practised by the "Schools" on one another and on outsiders, we moderns are utter

¹ Said by Aristotle of certain necessary truths. An agnostic will probably see in the phrase a contradiction in terms. Much in the same way Mill thought that the Aristotelian syllogism involved a *petitio principii*. It is a curious fact quite overlooked by Mill that this objection was met somewhat by Aristotle more than two thousand years ago

² The title of the work is *Defensio Fidei Catholicæ adversus Anglicanæ Sectæ errores*, quoted by Mr. Lecky, apparently at second hand, as Suarez *De Fide*.

strangers to anything like true philosophical criticism of so-called philosophical books. This statement will cease to be matter of surprise if we remember that in every branch of true criticism the learned world exacts certain conditions without which the critic cannot be said to be formed and will not be allowed to have his say. Obviously he must know his subject, but in this knowledge the knowledge of authorities also is rightly supposed to be included. Never was the phrase, "consult authorities," so much in vogue as now, never was public opinion in the good sense so bent on seeing that the student should make himself acquainted with the authorities who have traversed and illuminated the same line of research. Men are on the watch not only to catch him tripping in his statements, but also to discover what authorities he ought to have consulted and did not. Indeed this coercive spirit is sometimes carried to excess. Witness especially the article on Evolution by Mr. Sully in the new edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica," wherein every Evolutionist who has anything ridiculous to say on or off the subject has to be set down, ticketed, expounded, and thus have justice done him by the meek, long-suffering modern student. Friends, and imperious ones too, are always about to tell the critic in training that he should have taken down his Bede or Pepys or Blackstone, as the case may be. It is much to be regretted, they will say, that Mr. A. overlooked this treatise or that pamphlet, or presumed to sit down without his "Littre" or "Dr. Murray" before him. We are exquisitely sensitive about the honor due to authorities, and we form our critics accordingly. This rule of the republic of letters may be galling enough at times, but it has to be kept, and the republic's police are vigilant. If the great authority is right, he has to be read in order to develop and distance him; if he has gone wrong on a point, he has still to be read in order to be refuted, or some other authority who will refute him has to be appealed to.

Such is a part of the process of manufacture that a sound critic in history, for example, or philosophy, is put through. It is, on the whole, very salutary, and succeeds in fashioning men who in turn become real authorities. It provides that the unscientific element be eliminated and the highest qualities of the critical mind retained! The critic is now in the chair he deserves to fill, and maintains with an able hand the discipline of the department over which he presides. Inferior men will not, as a rule, venture to present him with flimsy and worthless books. Broadly speaking we may say that the high level maintained in our criticism of poetry is most effective in keeping down the growth of extravagantly bad productions in verse. Men are afraid of the critic. His periodical raids into the ranks of the great "unwhipped" are equally dreaded

and beneficial. No one now-a-days will seriously write a book to prove that John Dennis of Dunciad fame was a greater writer than Pope, or Colley Cibber a greater dramatist than Shakespeare. No one dare.

Yet what are we doing to form critics for the protection of philosophy and the terror of the wrongdoers and foolish who may trespass on this domain? Nothing at all. We do not form them, because we do not know how, and because, for all we know, Grote is as good a philosopher as Aristotle, or Mill as St. Thomas. We give no command to study authorities, because we know of none. It is not that we have examined them and found them wanting; we do not know the outside of their books, let alone their qualifications. There is, indeed, a vague notion that they are "discredited," but to be discredited is one of the worst forms of condemnation, and sentence of condemnation is lawful only after a hearing, and we never even professed to have given them a hearing. It is not as if we found in his first volume that Macaulay was untrustworthy as a historian, and then discarded him; it is as if a Frenchman, hearing the name of Chaucer, made no further inquiry, but proceeded to declare *ore rotundo* that there was no early English poet. We recklessly assert, "No first principles of philosophy have ever been established"—when we do not know whether they have ever been discussed. "Free-will has never been proved"—and we could not give a single argument that was ever advanced in its defence by its ablest defenders. "The natural law is a myth"—and we are utterly ignorant that a St. Augustine has thought it out, and that his arguments remain unanswered. If all these and scores of other truths are still regarded as perfectly open and unestablished, it is no wonder that the field of philosophy is invaded by hosts who cannot be more ignorant than the critics in command. They are free to say or do anything and everything ridiculous, because nothing seems ridiculous to those who know no better. If no one knew anything of history, how would it be shocking to maintain in a book that Alfred the Great was identical with Edward the Confessor? Yet it is no whit less absurd to maintain in philosophy, as some do gravely and unblushingly, that intellect is brain-stuff; if profound ignorance as to Shakespeare prevailed, who is to prevent us from saying that Cibber is as good as he? Yet this to one who knows both sides of the parallel would be about the same as to say that Suarez on "God's Providence" is no better than Mill against it. Do the upholders of Mill know the name of Suarez? Not till you tell them. Do they know that he is an authority? No. Do they know that he is *not* an authority? No. Do they know that his arguments have been answered? Yes. Who told them? Some modern authority said

that *all these men* were answered and discredited. Did *he* know Suarez? They don't know, but they suppose he did. Truly, without the check of criticism, men can and will say the most outrageous things, and without the study of the ancient authorities, there can be no criticism. Its absence in philosophy is a great incongruity in this critical age. More; it is a grievous evil to this would-be philosophical age, for philosophy cannot progress when its most rudimentary proofs are travestied or denied, and travestied and denied they ever will be until, acknowledging the impossibility of starting, at this age of the world, a brand-new and quite true system, we go and consult the older philosophers, not to worship, but honestly to examine them, and, according to that examination, to yield or withhold our assent. As it is, our position would be hardly tolerable were it not that our ignorance of our state is profound. Blissfully unconscious of our own inability to praise or censure judiciously, we look on while a company of fellow-blunderers perform in equally blissful unconsciousness the most fantastic tricks that ever made philosophy weep. There are few more extraordinary or more humiliating phenomena in the history of philosophy than the ascendancy over English thought exercised a few years ago by the Benthamite school. That miserable structure could not have stood for a day against the attack of an efficient body of critics, but there was none such.

Any kind of trick may be played with impunity on modern philosophers. Mr. Hallam ("History of Literature") gravely asserts: "The Fathers, with the exception, perhaps the single one, of St. Augustine, had taught the corporeity of the thinking substance." Mr. Lecky repeats the statement in perfect innocence. Professor Max Müller, with that blatant expression of general disbelief which is so unspeakably distressing to the higher type of the scientific character, lays it down in his "Science of Thought" that "there is no such thing as intellect, understanding, mind or reason." Mr. Jevons ("Principles of Science") fears that the existence of evil may be pushed to something like a demonstration against the existence of God. Mr. Daniel Greenleaf Thompson¹ in his "Problem of Evil" assures us that the free-will controversy has closed forever in the utter discomfiture of the upholders of freedom. If, he adds, we are not prepared to take his word for this, he must refer us to men of science; if we are disposed to suspect bias in this body, he has only to hand us over to the good Christian man—he does not say he was also a Calvinist—Jonathan Edwards. None of these men, be it observed, are in the least ashamed of

¹ "Of New York City," as we are told in the advertisement of another work of his.

themselves. Why should they be? They have usually acted up to their lights. They consulted no authorities, for no one pointed them out. They evolved all things from their own minds, because they were not told of any minds that were better. Then they played before critics, and the critics applauded because they were no true critics.

As are the critics, so are the books which they are incompetent to criticise. With the exception of mathematical treatises and some few scientific ones, we may say that books wholly occupied with rigorous demonstration and close reasoning are absolutely unknown to us. The dearth of such works is not recognized as deplorable because, on the principle of the relativity of knowledge, the lower intellectual functions which we see exhibited in the books we have, are not known to us *as* the lower, but as the only ones.

Let us not be unjust to ourselves. We can do far more feats than are enumerated in Matthew Arnold's meagre catalogue of Philistine achievements: "Doors that open, windows that shut, locks that turn, razors that shave, coats that wear, watches that go." In scientific and historical research and philological criticism, to mention only three things out of many, we stand immeasurably above all the progress of all the ages gone before. But it must be borne in mind that philosophy is wider than all this, and that there are in it vast recesses which we know nothing of, and to which we cannot possibly penetrate without an equipment which, as a matter of fact, we have not got. How does the able historical work show that we are possessed of great reasoning powers as such? It shows nothing of the sort. It proves undoubtedly our possession of extended knowledge, large sympathies and impartial judgment; and bristling foot-notes will probably evidence our inexhaustible patience in the examination of original records. But, valuable as these qualities are, they are but a small fraction of the capacities of the human mind. If Aristotle and Albertus Magnus were great naturalists in their day, and employed many scientific methods, and displayed some of the highest qualities of the scientific mind, they were also something more. They were deep thinkers about the soul, and truth, and happiness, and virtue, and good, and evil, all of them matters of import to men, and many of them, in the long run, of vast practical consequence. That "something more," which these philosophers had, we have not, whatever else we may have. We neither excel ourselves, nor respect those who excel in what is, after all, a higher sphere of thought. Our spirit of toleration has, indeed, softened the asperities of our language in regard to that unhappy class of men, but it may be doubted whether

the feelings with which Thomas Hobbes regarded them are more charitable now.¹

If the above contention be at all correct, if the accuracy of thought essential to true philosophy be replaced in modern days by lame analysis and questionable logic, a corresponding loss in the clearness of our philosophical language may be looked for.

A word on this point may be added. If the charge of obscurity of expression is to be proved against modern philosophy, we cannot fairly be required to put on our charge-sheet anything except those metaphysical or purely psychological subjects wherein alone obscurity is possible; that is to say, all the clearness, for example, of Dr. Bain on the physiological parts of psychology, on nerves and muscles and organs, where there is no room for the crimes of unintelligibility, cannot be adduced as rebutting evidence.

Only one extract can here be given. It is not affected by its context, it is anything but a solitary instance, and it is typical of the language of Mr. Spencer as a professed metaphysician. So regarded, it would seem to indicate, on the part of English expression, an approximation to the rapidity of descent with which much German philosophy has gone down into the depths of the unintelligible.²

"The conception of a rhythmically-moving mass of sensible matter is a synthesis of certain states of consciousness that stand related in a certain succession. The concept of a rhythmically-moving molecule is one in which these states and their relations have been reduced to the extremest limits of dimension representable to the mind, and are then assumed to be further reduced far beyond the limits of representation. So that this rhythmically-moving molecule which is our unit of composition of external phenomena, is mental in a three-fold sense. Our experiences of a rhythmically-moving mass, whence the conception of it is derived, are states of mind having objective counterparts that are unknown; the derived conception of a rhythmically-moving molecule is formed

¹ Quoting Luther with approval, Hobbes says ("Questions concerning Liberty, etc."): "Aquinas set up the kingdom of Aristotle, the destroyer of godly doctrine." This from Hobbes, who was himself a violent opponent of Free Will! Again, in the treatise "Of Man," cap. 8, speaking of Suarez and other schoolmen, he remarks: "This kind of absurdity may rightly be numbered among the many sorts of madness, and all the time that guided by clear thoughts of their worldly lust they forbear disputing or writing thus, but lucid intervals." Most of the great scholastics, as we know, were furnished by the Franciscan, Dominican and Jesuit Orders, all of which once wrote and fought so hard that they really had no time for "worldly lust," which, by the way, in Hobbes's mind seems to be a hopeful sign of mental sanity.

² See one of the most intelligible of German works, Lotze's "Microcosm." Even in the admirable translation of the late Miss Hamilton and Miss Jones, Lotze is not too clear.

of states of mind that have no directly-presented objective counterparts at all, and when we try to think of the rhythmically-moving molecule as we suppose it to exist, we do so by imagining that we have re-represented these representative states on an infinitely reduced scale. So that the unit out of which we build our interpretation of material phenomena is triply ideal.”—(*Principles of Psychology*, 2d edition, stereotyped, vol. i. p. 625.)

Neither Aristotle nor St. Thomas has anything to show to equal this.

We are painfully aware of the danger one runs in quoting passages like the foregoing, with the intention avowed above. Even to the politest of readers the obvious retort is open. “It may be to *him* unintelligible, but who is he?” etc. A personal reference is thus forced on me. We confess that at first we did feel in duty bound to be ashamed of the incapacity which failed to apprehend a great writer’s meaning. Then we read and re-read. A comfortable suspicion at last dawned, which gradually ripened into the conviction that it was not wholly our stupidity that was to blame, but that the writer was, essentially and intrinsically, unintelligible. There are, of course, some who say that they can understand all or nearly all of such writing, but we must not be rudely skeptical.¹ To us, at least, less gifted mortals, much, very much of it, seems nothing short of glorified rubbish.

One thing is certain, that works like Mr. Spencer’s mark an epoch in philosophical expression. It is impossible to conceive that a committee, composed of certain great names in English philosophy, say, Bacon, Locke, Hobbes and Paley, and appointed to report on Mr. Spencer, could do their work properly; the language of the 16th, 17th and 18th century philosophy is so essentially different from ours, that is, from Mr. Spencer’s. It may be doubted whether they would understand one page of his metaphysical style. The presumption is that there must be something wrong, at least in his language.

Starting from one of the so-called problems of the day, we were led to dwell on a difficulty or disqualification which we thought existed in regard to the profitable discussion of any such matters at all.

Briefly, our reasoning and logical powers are not equal to the task.

This evil, we are confident, would be remedied in great measure by a studious and judicious reading of the great reasoners of the old philosophy, especially St. Thomas Aquinas.

But here our protest tends to become a plea, and this must not be.

¹ One can better say strong things in Greek, and not seem too severe; *οὐδ’ ἔστι ἀναλχαῖον ἃ τις λέγει ταῦτα ὑπολαμβάνειν*.—“Arist. *Metaphys.*, iii. 3.

WHAT THE LANGUAGES OWE TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

AS language is made up of words, and as the Catholic Church is founded by the Eternal Word, there ought naturally to be a close connection between the Church and language. Doubtless all things were created by this same Word: "The world was made by Him, and without Him was made nothing that was made." But the Church is His new, His supernatural creation, the kingdom of all regenerated in Him, His spouse "without spot or wrinkle." The creation of the universe cost Him but one word, *fiat*; that of the Church took Him thirty-three years of doing and teaching. This world and the figure thereof shall pass away, but the Church triumphant shall abide forever.

The Incarnate Word built His Church upon the rock, Peter, a new name, a word coined as it were out of Simon's faith in Our Lord's divinity, professed in these words: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God;" by which he merited to hear, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven;" and again, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren." Faith, then, in Christ is the support of the Rock itself, and consequently of the whole spiritual edifice built upon the Rock, the Church. But "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Here we see language made the instrument whereby to establish, consolidate, and perpetuate that masterpiece of creation, the Church of God. Faith in the word of God is not only the foundation and support of the Church, but the very life of every member in the Church, and, therefore, of the whole Church. "Man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God." "The just man liveth by faith." "This is the victory which overcometh the world, our faith." Thus the Word builds His Church upon the Rock imbedded in his own word adhered to by faith, and supports it by that same word, which, though "heaven and earth shall pass away, shall not pass away." Had we nothing more than this, remembering that words constitute language, we should expect to find a very remarkable relation subsisting between the Catholic Church and the languages.

But this is not all. When the promise of the Eternal Word was fulfilled, and the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, descended upon the

Apostles with the plenitude of His gifts and power, to enable them to complete and perpetuate the work begun by the Eternal Word, He appeared in the form of fiery tongues. What did this denote? It denoted what immediately followed: "And they began to speak in divers tongues the wonderful works of God." It denoted that, as they had received the gift of faith through the words of the Uncreated Word, so they were to use the same means, words (language), for the same end, viz., that their hearers might receive the gift of faith and be incorporated into the spiritual Body of Christ, the Church. It denoted that, since human means were wanting, they were to be supernaturally supplied with the means of carrying out their most ample mission and of executing their most imperative orders, "Go, teach all nations." For it is absolutely necessary for the teacher to use the language of the taught, since language is the medium of communication between mind and mind. But the Teacher of all nations must be versed in the languages of all nations. Therefore, the Divine Enlightener and Guide of the Church came upon the Apostles in the form of tongues of fire, enabling them to communicate by language the light of truth with which He filled their minds, and to diffuse on all sides the fire of charity with which He inflamed their hearts. Nor was it alone at the birth of the Church that the miracle of tongues was witnessed. It has been repeated from time to time through all the ages since in favor of her children, her zealous missionaries, dispensers of the divine word, as is abundantly proved in the case of St. Francis Xavier, St. Paul of the Cross, and so many others.

How faithfully the Catholic Church has fulfilled her sublime office of Teacher of all nations has been repeatedly acknowledged, even by those who are not of her fold, and, indeed, holds the most prominent place on the pages of history. The Head of the Church is always mindful of the injunction given him in the person of Peter, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." The whole flock must be fed with "the words of eternal life." For this there is need of all the languages, for the flock is found in every country in the world. The languages must hold a prominent place, too, in the armory of the Church in her spiritual warfare against ignorance and error. Each Christian combatant is told to take unto him "the shield of faith and the sword of the Spirit (which is the word of God)." Every follower of Christ is a soldier, who must fight the good fight, and take heaven by violence.

The burning zeal with which the Apostles issued forth from the Cœnaculum, the ardor with which heroic armies of Catholic missionaries have since spread their peaceful conquests over the earth, the eagerness with which the Church now stretches out her maternal arms to the nations and tribes that are yet shrouded in igno-

rance and barbarism, were well symbolized, on the day of Pentecost, by the "cloven tongues, as it were, of fire." For fire is an active principle, ever striving to communicate its nature to all within its reach, diffusing around it light and heat, and always mounting upward. Such, too, are Charity and her eldest daughter, Zeal. They cannot remain inactive. So long as there are minds in the darkness of ignorance, hearts in the coldness of selfishness, these heaven-born virtues will go out toward them in floods of light and heat, bearing to all the knowledge and love of the true, the beautiful, and the good, thus refining, civilizing, and elevating them to the sublime sphere of their supernatural destiny. And such, again, has been pre-eminently the character of the Catholic Church; it is such to-day, and such it will be to the end of time. *Gratis* she has received, *gratis* does she desire to give of her abundance. She is the sun in the spiritual universe, enlightening, beautifying, and animating all; the reservoir of heavenly graces and benedictions, supplied to overflowing from the Eternal Fountain; the organ through which the Eternal Father communicates with his adopted children, the Mother of all the faithful, the civilizer of nations, the promoter of learning, the support of art and science, the friend of the downtrodden, the benefactress and liberator of the human race, the great central mart of all the languages, their union *dépôt*.

The Church is intensely aware of the immense importance of her high mission as teacher of nations, and of the greatness of the reward awaiting those who do and teach; and, therefore, reckons all labor sweet, all sacrifices easy, all losses gain, that she may accomplish her task and be able to render a good account to the Prince of Pastors at His coming. Accordingly we see with what alacrity and devotedness the bishops and priests of the Catholic Church, from the very days of the Apostles down through every age, set themselves to evangelizing, and by evangelizing civilizing, elevating, and refining the world. Teaching is her first and indispensable duty, since "faith is the substance of things to be hoped for," the foundation of all Christian virtues. "Without faith it is impossible to please God." But faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. And how can they hear without a teacher, a divinely sent teacher, an infallible teacher? Only the Catholic Church is such a teacher, only she is stamped with the seal of heaven, inerrancy, unity, apostolicity.

The Apostles deemed it "not fit to leave the word of God," even for corporeal works of mercy, and therefore elected deacons "to serve tables." The "Vessel of Election" says of himself, that he baptized very few, "for Christ sent me, not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." He writes to Timothy, "Preach the word

of God; be instant in season, out of season." The Apostles were cast into prison for preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ. An angel delivered them, and they went on preaching more forcibly than ever. They were charged by the rulers of the people and the ancients, "not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus." They answered, "If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." And they went and "spoke the word of God with confidence." Sublime *Non possumus!* so often repeated since, when "the Gentiles raged, and the people devised vain things: The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes assembled together against the Lord and against his Christ;" aye, and against His Vicar on earth, the visible Head of the Church. *Non possumus*, cried St. Gregory the Seventh to Henry the Fourth. We cannot allow you to intrude your hirelings into the places of true pastors, nor see the flock intrusted to us perish for want of seasonable spiritual food. Some three centuries ago, it was attempted, on a large scale, to substitute the religion of Luther, or of Calvin, or of Henry the Eighth, for that of Jesus Christ, and it was proposed, at least, to modify this in several particulars; but the whole Church, assembled in Council, energetically declared aloud, *Non possumus*. We cannot change or modify the sacred deposit of revealed truth committed to our safe keeping, for it is absolutely unchangeable. Let the nations that will have the variable and varying novelties of man's devising, instead of the whole unadulterated truth, be cut off as rotten branches. And behold they have withered and decayed, and are now hardly recognizable under the varied forms of descending rationalism, of putrescent sentimentalism, and the dry bones of agnosticism and evolutionism. *Non possumus*, cried More and Fisher, as they ascended the scaffold. We can die, but we cannot accept Henry the Eighth as Pope, as supreme teacher of faith and morals. *Non possumus*, repeated all Ireland, after their bishops and priests, when, hunted down like wild beasts, they sought some secluded spot behind a remote hedge, or in the bogs, or on the mountain-side, where they might offer up the Holy Sacrifice, teach their flocks and minister to their spiritual wants, at the risk of paying the penalty of death for every such act, rendered treasonable by order of Queen Elizabeth. We cannot barter our faith for any consideration. *Non possumus*, said magnanimous Pius the Ninth, when the nations called upon him by the voice of public opinion to conform his teaching to the fashion of the age, which they styled progress. Then came Bismarck, ordering every Catholic priest and bishop off the Prussian soil if they did not accept the alternative of becoming tools of the state, and teaching its doctrine instead of the gospel of Jesus Christ;

and the bishops and priests, with one voice, cried out, *Non possumus*. They cheerfully incurred fines and penalties, prison and expatriation, by nobly disregarding that mockery of law put forth in contravention to the command of God. *Non possumus*, say the hierarchy and clergy of France to the laicizing tyrants of the Republic. We cannot consent to worship Hugo, or Voltaire, or any other such deity of yours, instead of Jesus Christ. We cannot send our children to your schools, where such abominable superstitions are taught and practised. We cannot give up our Christian schools; we must have Christian teachers. *Non possumus*, say our zealous pastors, and our fervent practical Catholics at home, to the voice of a miserable petty economy. We cannot send our children to their godless public schools, nor risk their loss of faith, more precious than gold, for any paltry consideration. Of the two evils we prefer the less—the gross injustice of having to pay for schools that are a public nuisance. For the time being, we will build and support our own schools. *Non possumus*, say those vigilant and conscientious parents, who feel the weight of their responsibility, to a certain class of newspapers and periodicals. We cannot admit your worthless trash under our roof, nor allow our virtuous family to read your vile articles and foul pages, where our holy religion and venerable Mother Church are maligned and vilified, virtue ridiculed, sound principles ignored, and scenes of refined immorality and scandal presented attractively for pastime. *Non possumus*, say those courageous youths whom the syren voice of the tempter would turn aside from the high paths of rectitude and honor. We cannot descend from the peaceful and delightful road of virtue into the low and crooked ways of vice and dishonesty, nor exchange eternal joys for momentary pleasure.

What St. Paul said of himself, "Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel," has always been the sentiment of the *Ecclesia docens*. Woe unto me if I teach not the nations. It being of the very essence of her mission to teach all nations, the Church must have made the study of languages a duty of primary importance to all aspirants to the sacred ministry. The Propaganda at Rome, of polyglot celebrity, is a specimen of the care and attention bestowed upon this important subject throughout the Church's long and grand career. Speaking of the linguistic powers displayed by the students of this distinguished seat of learning, on occasion of the late visit of the Irish bishops to Rome, the *Moniteur de Rome*, as quoted by the *Ave Maria*, says: "These literary productions, in language of every nation—from Hebrew, Chaldean, Persian, to Russian, English, and Italian—presented a remarkable proof of the cosmopolitan and civilizing work of the Propaganda. The recitations were interspersed with songs or hymns peculiar to the

country whose language was represented." It is well known that there are thirty-two languages spoken there. It is only the Catholic Church that could have given us that polyglot wonder of the world, Mezzofanti.

The Catholic missionaries were not content with knowing and speaking the languages of the countries they went to evangelize and civilize. They wrote grammars and dictionaries of those languages, had them published, and by their superior skill in the more perfect languages awakened in natives and foreigners attention to what they found good in those languages, thus attaching an importance to the subject it otherwise never would have had. "The missionaries of Central Africa," writes the *Ave Maria* a few weeks ago, "have had printed at Paris the first Ruganda grammar. This language is spoken by the people dwelling on the borders of Lake Victoria Nyanza. The missionaries, having no writings to assist them in its study, were obliged to depend solely upon conversations with the natives. The grammar is the result of three years' labor. A dictionary, containing six or seven hundred words, together with select stories and legends, was also prepared by these apostolic men, but, unfortunately, the manuscript was lost in a shipwreck. They are, however, actively at work in repairing the loss."

Thus has the Church been ever improving and refining and elevating the languages at the same time that she has been advancing the people intellectually and morally, socially and politically, individually and collectively. Take up any of the literatures of Europe; examine its origin, development and progress; study its genius, aptitudes and peculiarities, and you will invariably find that the Catholic Church has exercised by far the most powerful influence in bringing it to its present state of perfection. Bishop Ulphilas, between 360 and 379, translated almost the whole Bible into Moeso-Gothic, which is the earliest specimen extant of the Teutonic languages. He framed a new alphabet of twenty-four letters, four of which were invented by himself. The *Codex Argenteus* (rather *Aureus et Argenteus*) is still preserved at Upsal, enclosed in a silver case.

In his *History of English Literature and Language* Craik says (p. 27): "It is somewhat remarkable that, while a good many names of the natives of Gaul are recorded in connection with the last age of Roman literature, scarcely a British name of that period of any literary reputation has been preserved, if we except a few which figure in the history of the Christian Church." But the first ages of English literature are equally remarkable for the conspicuous absence of other than names immediately connected with the Catholic Church. St. Gildas the Wise, the first English historian

of whom anything remains, was of course her son. There never was a saint out of her communion. She only put on a new and perfect form when her Divine Founder put on the form of man; she was the Church of God from the beginning, as she will be to the end. The next historical writer was a monk of Bangor, Nennius or Ninian.

Now of all writers who do not treat *ex professo* of language, the historian does most for the language of that people for whom he writes, in its earliest stage. He writes for the whole people, and therefore must adopt a style at once plain and simple, yet sufficiently dignified and diversified to meet the requirements of his subject. His object being to convey the truth of facts (we are not including our inventors of facts for scientific histories), his main point is to attach plain, intelligible signs to clear and fixed ideas, precluding the possibility of doubt or equivocation, the one thing most wanted in the first development of a language.

Aldhelm, abbot of Malmesbury, and first Bishop of Sherborn, who died in 709, who "could write and speak Greek like a native of Greece," is the most ancient of the Latin writers among the Angles and Saxons whose works remain. But it may be asked, What have Latin and Greek, which the Catholic Church has in some sort made her own, to do with the English language? Let G. P. Marsh answer: "The Latin Grammar has become a general standard, wherewith to compare that of all other languages, the medium through which all the nations of Christendom have become acquainted with the structure and philosophy of their own; and technical grammar, the mechanical combinations of language, can be nowhere else so advantageously studied," except, of course, at Harvard!

Hear Mr. Marsh again: "I do but echo the universal opinion of all persons competent to pronounce on the subject, in expressing my own conviction that the language and literature of ancient Greece constitute the most efficient instrument of mental training ever enjoyed by man; and that a familiarity with that wonderful speech, its poetry, its philosophy, its eloquence, and the history it embalms, is incomparably the most valuable of intellectual possessions. The Grammar of the Greek language is much more flexible, more tolerant of aberration, less rigid in its requirements, than the Latin." Remark here that, as intellectuality is the measure of language, great indeed must be the gain to all our modern languages from the Greek, and great, too, should be our gratitude to the Catholic Church for having handed it down to us replete with a new and transcending importance, its being made the vehicle of the written word of God.

Venerable Bede greatly enriched the English language. He

wrote treatises on Grammar, the Logic of Aristotle, Orthography and Versification, all which bear directly on language. For logic, in fixing the thought, fixes also the expression, giving precision, cogency and clearness to the language. The accomplished author of *Christian Schools and Scholars*, speaking of Bede's numerous works (forty-five), makes these remarks: "There is one subject which engaged his attention that deserves a more particular notice; I mean the labors he directed to the grammatical formation of his native language, a work of vast importance, which, in every country where the barbarous nations had established themselves, had to be undertaken by the monastic scholars. Rohrbacher observes that St. Bede did much by his treatises on grammar and orthography to impress a character of regularity on the modern languages which in the eighth and ninth centuries were beginning to be formed out of the Latin and Germanic dialects. Much more was his influence felt on the Anglo-Saxon dialect, in which he both preached and wrote. . . . Besides commenting on nearly the whole Bible, Bede is known to have translated both the Psalter and the Four Gospels. . . . Before their conversion to Christianity the Anglo-Saxons possessed no literature, that is to say, no *written* compositions of any kind, and their language had not therefore assumed a regular grammatical form. In this they resembled most of the other barbarous nations, of whom St. Irenæus observes that they held the faith by tradition, 'without the help of pen and ink;' meaning, as he himself explains, that for want of letters they could have no use of the Scriptures."

Ex uno disce omnes. Thus the nations of Europe to-day use the very languages that were, with themselves, snatched from barbarism by the Catholic Church, to vilify their common benefactress. But "the servant is not above his master." Glorious sign of the Spouse of Christ! "Blessed are you when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake." It is unnecessary to mention Wilfrid, Boniface, Alfred, and other names of early renown in English literature. We have seen what Bishop Ulphilas did for the Moeso-Gothic, and, therefore, for all the later Teutonic dialects, and consequently for the largest element in the English language. We have seen what Bede did for the Anglo-Saxon, and accordingly for our modern English.

The next largest element in the English language, Latin, is altogether the language of the Church. Latin is one of the three languages that had been, in a manner, sanctified by touching the sacred emblem of redemption, whose privilege it was to proclaim the kingship of the Incarnate Word, and must not, therefore, perish. Like the Cross, to which it was fastened, it was destined to

be enshrined with honor, and to live a glorious life in the magnificent ritual and awe-inspiring services of the Catholic Church. It is a dead language to the worldling and to those who are not of the household of the Faith; but to the fervent Catholic, who instinctively recognizes the sweet accents of his beautiful mother-tongue, it has a charm that speaks to his heart of heaven and heavenly things. It was too near the adorable Head of the Man-God in His supreme ignominy, not to share in the halo of glory with which it was crowned in the resurrection. Now without the Latin there was no Italian, no French, no Spanish language. Without the Catholic Church, as everybody admits, there was no Latin, no Greek, no Hebrew worth mentioning, centuries ago. A few fragmentary fossil remains might possibly be casually dug up here and there from some buried archives or discovered in the vaults beneath a library cremation. But the Catholic Church touched them, and, behold, they live! The word of life has been committed to them, and she guards them as the apple of her eye. Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic and Greek had already been consecrated to the sacred purpose of transmitting the Old Testament from generation to generation; and now Latin receives its hallowed contents augmented by the New, and carries them beyond the limits of the Roman Empire into regions over which her victorious eagle had never ventured his daring flight.

"The introduction of Christianity among the Anglo-Saxons at the opening of the seventh" (close of the sixth) "century," writes Noah Webster, "brought with it the study of the Latin. The cultivation of learning and letters belonged almost exclusively to ecclesiastics, with whom Latin was the professional language. Hence quite a number of Latin or Latinized Greek words passed into the Anglo-Saxon." So true is it that learning and culture have been introduced into the nations of Enrope, aye, and wherever they are found out of Europe, together with Christianity and civilization, by the Catholic Church, that in several languages a learned man and clergyman are synonymous. *Cleric* in Anglo-Saxon, *clerk* in English, and *clerc* in French, are instances, a fact which the *Kultur-kampf* in Prussia and the anti-clericals in France seem sublimely to ignore.

If Latin and her daughter French have, according to Webster, given four-fifths of its borrowed words to the English language, and if we take his word for it, as I think we may, that "if all the words in a large English dictionary were classed according to their origin, it would appear that the foreign or non-Saxon words make a decided majority of the whole number," we can easily calculate the indebtedness of the English language to Latin and the indebtedness of all who use it to the Catholic Church. In Milton's poet-

ical works about two-thirds of the vocabulary are foreign, which shows how much we owe both for matter and form to that Church which he so heartily berated with his bitterest invective. But this is not so strange for one who shone in the golden age of the "Reformation," when in this, its last age,

" *Cui non invenit ipsa*
Nomen, et a nullo posuit Natura metallo,"

"Nature cannot frame
A metal base enough to give it name,"

we hear G. P. Marsh lecture to post-graduates in Columbia College, N. Y., in this strain: "The Romish Church, too, in England, as everywhere else, was hostile to all intellectual effort which in any degree diverged from the path marked out by ecclesiastical habit and tradition, and very many important English benefices were filled by foreign priests quite ignorant of the English tongue." Indeed! Why, without just such foreign influence the English tongue had remained the barbarous jargon the Catholic Church first found it, and the English people the savages Cæsar and Tacitus describe them. If by "intellectual effort" is meant the attempt to palm off some counterfeit article for genuine truth, whether in the natural or supernatural order, in philosophy or theology, science or history, the Church has always set her face against it, is professedly, irreconcilably, necessarily hostile to it, because she is the "pillar and ground of truth." For "what fellowship hath light with darkness?" Chameleon-like or Proteus-like, error may assume a new color or a new form at every new moon, may defend itself behind the rampart of power and fashion and talent, may lurk in the labyrinths of pretended science, the Catholic Church pursues it, dismantles it, exposes and throttles it. To every "Eirenicon" her answer is "Peace through the Truth." From Gnosticism to Agnosticism, from Arianism to the last phase of Protestantism, Rationalism, there is not a single error of any note that has not felt her implacable hostility.

And yet Mr. Marsh is frank enough to make the following statement in another lecture of the same series: "The missionary who goes armed with the cross, not with the sword, must use a speech intelligible to those whom he would convert. . . . The Gothic tribes generally were brought to Christianity by arguments and persuasions addressed to them by ministers speaking to every man in his own tongue." Every word of this is luminous with truth, if *all* be substituted for "generally," and if the interference of miracles on some occasions, and of supernatural divine grace on all occasions, be superadded to the "arguments and persua-

sions " as prime factors in Christianizing and civilizing not alone the Gothic tribes, but all the nations that have yet been civilized. To call Pagan enlightenment, with its revolting ritual and low moral status, civilization, shocks all sense. "Corrumpere et corrumpi sæculum vocatur," is the vouchment of Tacitus regarding Roman virtue and propriety in his day.

But if the lecturer means that the Catholic Church has ever been hostile to any department of genuine science, arts, or letters, the history of the literature of every country, and of the intellectual development of every people, gives him the lie. Roger Bacon is a fair specimen of the circumscribed limits imposed upon "intellectual effort" in schools established by the Catholic Church in those benighted Middle Ages. His writings that are still preserved, of which the principal is that entitled his "Opus Majus" (or "Great Work"), show that the range of his investigations included theology, grammar, the ancient languages, geometry, astronomy, chronology, geography, music, optics, mechanics, chemistry, and most of the other branches of experimental philosophy. "In all these sciences," writes Mr. Craik, "he had mastered whatever was then known; and his knowledge, though necessarily mixed with much error, extended in various directions considerably farther than, but for the evidence of his writings, we should have been warranted in believing that scientific researches had been carried in that age." It is well known that his writings anticipate the discovery of the telescope, and that he was acquainted with the effects and composition of gunpowder; but it may not be equally well known that it was at the suggestion of Pope Clement IV. that he gave to the world his "Opus Majus," so hostile was the Church from head to foot, then as now, to liberal education, to freedom of intellect.

We will now take an example of the extent of learning on the Continent in those days, and this from the Dominicans, as our last was from the Franciscans, two of the teaching orders of the Catholic Church. "Albertus Magnus," says Humboldt, "was equally active and influential in promoting the study of natural science and of the Aristotelian philosophy. . . . His works contain exceedingly acute remarks on the organic structure and physiology of plants. One of his works, bearing the title of *Liber Cosmographicus de Natura Locorum*, is a species of physical geography. I have found in it considerations on the dependence of temperature concurrently on latitude and elevation, and on the effect of different angles of incidence of the sun's rays in heating the ground, which have excited my surprise."

Jourdain says of him: "Whether we consider him as a theologian or a philosopher, Albert was undoubtedly one of the most

extraordinary men of his age; I might say, one of the most wonderful men of genius that have appeared in past time." The Church has reared a goodly number of such men in every age, and still rears them, and will continue to rear them; for she is to-day as radiant in youth and beauty and vigor as when she came forth, with the Pentecostal blessing on her brow, to regenerate the world, the fruitful Mother of heroic virtue and profound learning, of saints and savants.

Thus again speaks M. Meyer of Albertus: "No botanist who lived before Albert can be compared to him, unless it be Theophrastus, with whom he was not acquainted; and after him none has painted nature in such living colors, or studied it so profoundly, until the time of Conrad, Gesner, and Cesalpini. All honor, then, to the man who made such astonishing progress in the science of nature as to find no one, I will not say to surpass, but even to equal him for the space of three hundred years."

Albert himself says of his book on botany: "All that is here set down is the result of our own experience, or has been borrowed from authors whom we know to have written what their personal experience has confirmed; for in these matters experience alone can give certainty." This shows that Albert was not alone in his devotion to the natural sciences, and that experimental sciences did not originate with Francis Bacon. It also shows that, if such was the proficiency, under the fostering care of the Church, of intellectual effort in departments most remote from sciences that have direct relation to mental operations, and consequently from immediate bearing upon language, the Church must have exerted on language a cumulative influence that can be calculated only by estimating the immense impetus she gave and continues to give to the arts and sciences individually.

It is well known that all the great schools and universities of Europe between the 2d and 17th centuries were the creation of the Catholic Church. In the famous school of Alexandria, founded by St. Mark the Evangelist, we find, as early as 231, Origen, pupil and successor of Clement, teaching St. Gregory and his brother Athenodorus "logic, in order to exercise their minds and enable them to discover true reasoning from sophistry; physics, that they might understand and admire the works of God; geometry, which by its clear and indisputable demonstrations serves as a basis to the science of thought; astronomy, to lift their hearts from earth to heaven; and finally, philosophy, which was not limited, like that taught in the pagan schools, to empty speculations, but was conveyed in such a way as to lead to practical results. All these were but steps to ascend to that higher science which teaches us the existence and nature of God. He permitted

his pupils freely to read whatever the poets and philosophers had written on this subject, himself watching and directing their studies, and opening their eyes to distinguish those sparks of truth which are to be found scattered in the writings of the pagans, however overlaid by a mass of fable."

There does not appear much circumscribing of "intellectual effort" here. It was encouraged, like the bee, to gather the honey of truth from every flower in every art and science. Well does Augusta T. Drane remark on this: "The real point worth observing is, that every branch of human knowledge, in so far as it had been cultivated at that time, was included in the studies of the Christian schools; and, considering that this had been the work of scarcely more than two centuries, and those centuries of bloody persecution, it must be acknowledged to have been a tolerably expansive growth."

Yes, "growth" was stamped on every feature of human learning under the generous patronage of the Catholic Church, until it established its great centres in the universities of Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, Bologna, Padua, Pisa, Louvain, etc. Of the "growth" of one of these, Oxford, from the day it was plundered by the "Reformation" to our own day, Sir William Hamilton writes: "Oxford is, of all academical institutions, at once the most imperfect and the most perfectible. *'Stat magni nominis umbra.'*"

We grant that the Catholic Church prescribes limits to thought, and says to the most towering genius or daring intellect, Thus far and no farther; but it is such check as reason herself imposes on such trespassers upon her domain as Mill, Fiske, and other agnostics, who claim that two and two may possibly make five, that truth is relative, that all that is unknowable which they cannot or do not comprehend, and such like absurdities. The Church has ever encouraged free thought until it has ceased to be reasonable, has rewarded intellectual effort so long as it has not become suicidal. Who has investigated the most abstruse problems within the range of human thought more freely, fearlessly, or profoundly than St. Augustine and St. Thomas? That Copernicus and Secchi were priests, did not hinder them from attaining their prominent place in science. The divinely-appointed infallible teacher of nations had too strong, too passionate a love for truth to allow any counterfeit impostor to usurp its honored place in the minds of men, under the specious name of philosophy or science. She knew beforehand the tough combat she had to enter with proud intellect wedded to cherished error, both in the service of a host of passions, and flattered by wealth, power, pomp and fashion. But, conscious of her strength, aided from on high, defended by

truth while defending it, her motto has ever been, *Magna est veritas, et prævalebit*. From Gnosticism and Neoplatonism in the Second and following centuries, to Agnosticism and Evolutionism in the 19th, her career has been one of conflict and of triumph. As Dr. Molloy tells us that he studied geology profoundly, in order to meet objections to revealed truth from that quarter, so St. Thomas studied Aristotle to meet Averroes on his own ground, proving as plain as two and two make four the absurdity of holding that all men have but one common intellect, the grand doctrine of the Arabian, whom his free-thinking contemporaries styled "the Commentator." This is the secret of the Church's devotedness to learning of every kind, always inculcating by word and example what one of her brightest ornaments has laid down in his world-wide wondrous little book: "Learning is not to be blamed, nor the mere knowledge of anything, which is good in itself, and ordained by God; but a good conscience and a virtuous life are always to be preferred before it."

Not alone must the *Ecclesia docens* be learned, the *Ecclesia credens*, all the faithful, are exhorted to be "always ready to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you." "Join with your faith, virtue; and with virtue, knowledge." Hence a good Catholic will be ashamed not to be able to give a reasonable answer to any reasonable question about his faith. Unreasonable questions deserve no answer; but may be shown to be unreasonable, or met with a smile of pity. Even *illiterate*, earnest Catholics have been found learned enough to give ample satisfaction to sincere inquirers, from their diligence in attending all the instructions of their pastors, whether in catechism or in sermons, missions, etc.

Now, general culture of the arts and sciences, which the Church has always encouraged and promoted, and in which her children have always excelled, must necessarily tend to improve the several languages. There is so close a connection between thought and its expression, the idea and the word, the signified and the sign, that the expansion, refinement, and elevation of the former are invariably attended, or followed, by a corresponding effect upon the latter. The enlightened mind ever finds a fluent tongue or ready pen, verifying the saying attributed to Socrates: "He is eloquent enough who knows his subject well enough." This is also a convincing proof that, with the gift of high intelligence, language was originally given to man directly by his bountiful Creator. Thinking cannot go far, nor deep, nor high, without its natural helpmate, language, as any one may find by experiment. Neither can language travel alone without intelligence, which called it into being, and which preserves its being by recognizing its significance. Lan-

guage is for intelligence, not intelligence for language ; and hence language may be dispensed with in certain cases, intelligence never. Language is necessary, because society is necessary. The Creator founded society by creating the family : He also gave it what it absolutely wants, language. Humboldt says that, if we accept not this, he knows of no explanation of the origin of that which is coeval and co-extensive with society. Upon this necessary connection between intelligence and language have I rested the above statement, that, but for the superior intelligence of the members of the Catholic Church, both lay and clerical, especially her Religious Orders, the three learned languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, had long since lain buried in oblivion. How could the barbarian hordes from the North, Vandals, Goths, Huns, etc., appreciate what they could not understand? Their inutility had been their death-warrant. All had shared the fate of the Alexandrian library had it not been for the monks and churchmen of the Middle Ages, whose unwearied toil some are too enlightened to recognize.

The influence of the Church upon the various languages has been exercised in yet another way, which we are apt to overlook ; we mean the nice precision and wonderful exactness of her official statements in all her doctrines. Like her Divine Founder, the Church never has "It is and it is not" in her teaching. She has never need of issuing a *revised edition* of her former pronouncements. The Pillar and Ground of Truth, she stamps the pure gold of truth with her infallible signet, and there it remains truth for aye, unchangeable and imperishable as its Infinite Source. The word that is to be admitted as the sign of this truth, the silver casket for the golden gem, is also nicely weighed, adjusted with all accuracy, and sent forth on its errand under no mistakable colors. It is the same word for the same idea, and the same idea for the same truth, thenceforth ever after as long as there are people to use that language. So precious is truth in her estimation that she condescends to examine in minutest detail every word, and every letter and accent in every word, as in *homoöusios* and *homoiousios* (ὁμοούσιος and ὁμοιούσιος), *theótokos* and *theotókos* (θεότοκος and θεοτόκος), marking the notable difference a letter or an accent may make in the truth conveyed.

Now this carefulness and exactness in the use of words extend through the whole domain of theology and philosophy. Words are not allowed to run slipshod under a haze of indefiniteness. Every pastor of souls, every priest empowered by her authority to preach the divine word, every writer who touches upon subjects connected with the sacred deposit committed to her keeping, must be severely on his guard in the use of words, that he may not come under her merciless censures. Hence the various

languages throughout the civilized world are made the special study of a large number of close students in the most perfect languages of all times. The result is a habit of exact thinking and apt expression, than which no greater gain can accrue to language. It was the want of this that Socrates charged so pointedly against the Sophists of his day. Indefiniteness of expression is always the shuffling contrivance of sophistry. Some, too, that abhor sophistry are under the mistaken notion that repeating the same word in the same sentence, or, if it can possibly be avoided, even in the same paragraph, argues a dearth in one's vocabulary, lack of skill in arrangement, or of taste to appreciate the charms of novelty. Such persons should never wear a second time, during the same month or year, the same coat, or hat, or shoes, lest they be convicted of poverty; nor drink coffee again till they have gone the rounds of all possible beverages.

If the idea is good, *i.e.*, exactly represents its object, and the word exactly fits the idea, no other word should be allowed to take its place. The surpassing beauty of truth shines forth through every word that is an exact counterpart of the idea, when this idea is in perfect conformity with its object. This conformity is found in infinite perfection in the Verbum Æternum, a conformity so unutterably perfect that all the beauty, goodness, and excellence of the Father is seen expressed in the "Figure of His Substance and the Splendor of His Glory," an absolute oneness of nature and perfections being common to the three Adorable Persons of the August Trinity.

And here, again, the Fathers and Doctors of the Catholic Church, in expounding to the extent of human capacity the grand mysteries of our holy faith, have poured a sea of light upon many important and abstruse questions connected with the philosophy of the human mind, its faculties, and their operations. For, as the soul of man is made to the image of God, there must be an analogy, faint though it necessarily be, between the eternal simple operation in the Trinity, which operation our complex nature must contemplate as multiple, and the manifold operations of our several faculties. Thus the light of faith, enlightening instead of extinguishing the light of reason, enables man to see the similitude between the Divine Word and our *verbum mentale*, which mental word true philosophy discovers in every act of intellection, in the completion of every idea. Every idea implies an intellect knowing and an object known. The Divine Intellect, as being infinite, must necessarily be active, and consequently must have an infinite object, which object is the Divine Nature or Essence, infinite being, infinite reality. Faith tells us that this Infinite Nature,

one and indivisible, is equally possessed by three Divine Persons, perfectly distinct and perfectly equal, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Reason, also, shows us in our own minds in every act of intellection an image of this trinity in unity. The object known is one and the same to the intellect that knows, the idea through which it knows, and the affection or emotion consequent upon this knowledge. It is the same soul that knows as intellect, that is modified as idea, that is affected or moved by such knowledge and such modification. The intellect that knows, in the idea through which it knows, knows also itself; for the idea is the intellect modified. Known thus, the intellect knows itself in act, which knowledge is often expressed by the formula, We know that we know. This is properly an act of consciousness, the vaguest of vague terms in the hands of many recent writers, especially Agnostics, which, however, is nothing else than intellect cognizing itself and its own and the mind's present state. Knowing that it knows, the intellect affirms or expresses to itself this knowledge, which expression is called mental word, *verbum mentale*, in relation to the mind, idea in relation to the object it represents. This idea or mental word is begotten of the intellect in conjunction with the object known or mentally conceived, and, hence, is sometimes called concept. It may also be called the offspring of the intellect, though not of it alone, man being essentially dependent not alone on his Creator, but on creatures also, for every act of every faculty. This offspring exists as soon as intellect is called into act or exists in act.

These facts, which a moment's reflection upon our own mental activity makes evident, will enable us to understand a little, very little, to be sure, but still some little, of what faith teaches us with absolute certainty regarding the first and greatest of mysteries. The Father, Infinite Intelligence, knowing Himself, expresses this knowledge to Himself, and thus begets His Eternal Son, the Verbum Divinum, who, because of the infinite perfection of that knowledge, is a subsisting personality, the very "figure of the Father's substance and the splendor of His glory," at once infinitely known and infinitely knowing. This Verbum was conceived or begotten of the Father before all ages, *i.e.* eternally, because from eternity as necessarily existing as the Father is necessarily knowing; and, because so generated and so existing, is called the Eternal Son of God. The Son is necessary as the Father is necessary. Even so is our mental word necessary to every act of intellection, and exists as soon as intellect exists in act. Our oral word is but the outward manifestation of the mental word. This we are free to utter or not, as we please. God, too, was free to create or not to create the universe and all it contains, which may be called His eternal

word, "*Cæli enarrant gloriam Dei*," as also to utter his revealed word. But all that he has outwardly expressed, whether by creation or by revelation, He eternally expressed in the Uncreated Word, the Coëternal Son; "and without Him was made nothing that was made."

It is a mistake to suppose, as some do, that the oral word expresses the object directly and immediately. It is by expressing the mental word or idea, which represents the object, that the oral word expresses also the object.

In thus tracing the analogy between the Divine Mind and our mind, besides the incomparable distance between the infinite and the finite, in every particular, the following are noteworthy points of difference. Created entities depend for their existence upon their prototypes or the exemplar ideas of them in the Divine Mind, which are the measure of existences. Our ideas depend for their existence upon created entities, and are measured by them. Created entities exist in consequence of the Divine ideas of them. Our ideas exist in consequence of created entities existing. In conforming our ideas to existing created entities, which are all conformed to their prototypes in the Divine Mind, we are so far being conformed to the Divine Mind. But as everything in the Divine Mind is perfection, we are by the same conformity tending to perfection, at least intellectually. Therefore the proper use of our faculties in attaining truth leads to God, the Fountain of all truth, being led through creatures "from Nature up to Nature's God." Hence the pursuit of learning is a laudable one. Every entity is at once true and good, reminding us of the infinite Ocean of Truth and Goodness whence it issued. If, therefore, our will follows right reason in loving the good, every act of knowing is accompanied or followed by an act of loving the Infinite Good, and "to them that love God all things work together unto good."

Since words are arbitrary signs, having no natural connection with the ideas signified, it is a strange whim that has led certain parties to claim a vast superiority for words of Saxon origin over other derivatives in the English language. It is of a piece with "There is no spot on earth like the land of *my* birth." That there is more force or terseness in Anglo-Saxon than in Anglo-Latin words is negated by the fact that, in some of the choicest and most vigorous writings in the English language, such as *Junius's Letters*, *Johnson's Letter to Lord Chesterfield*, Burke's masterpiece, the Latin element largely predominates; and that they possess more sweetness, harmony or beauty, some of the best poetry in the language, such as *Milton's* and *Lord Byron's*, equally denies. We do not stop at the sign; we go to what it signifies. It would take a Herbert Spencer to see "the greater forcibleness of Saxon-Eng-

lish, or rather non-Latin English," or the economy of using "original words used in childhood," making it preferable to "have" than to "possess," to "wish" than to "desire," to "think" than to "reflect," to have "play" than "amusement," etc. No matter whence, or how, or when a word came into reputable use, if it expresses the idea clearly and fully, it is ridiculous childishness to put it aside in deference to any other. Give us the writer or speaker that has clear thoughts, something worth communicating, and holds out to us unmistakable signs through which we can at once grasp his whole meaning, and we care not if they are monosyllabic or sesquipedalian, indigenous or exotic, idiomatic or imported, old or new. Refusing a well-fitting word because of its origin, is like refusing to be clothed in an excellent garment on the plea that the material of which it is made is the product of a foreign soil. The writer or speaker should choose that word which, by common consent, has become the recognized sign of his idea, on receipt of which the hearer or reader forms in his own mind the corresponding idea. Thus the two minds are so far at one, being conformed to the same sign, the one matching the sign to his idea, the other matching his idea to the sign, and consequently represent to themselves the same identical object.

We are too near the utmost limits of a review article to even touch upon some of the many philological vagaries put forth as theories regarding the progressive development of words from the original inarticulate chattering of the autochthonous pre-human *mutum pecus*, Darwin's progenitors, to our inimitable *nonpareil*, "the well of English undefiled." Their first principle, that savagery was man's primeval state, then barbarism, enlightenment, and finally *culture*, culminating in science, is one of those assumptions of *Necessary Progressionism* which laughs at the idea of verification by anything in the past or present, its all-sufficiency being sufficiently guaranteed by its adoption by the Evolutionists. It counts nothing that the best poet, the best orator, one of the best philosophers, the best sculptor, and the best painter, ever trumpeted by fame, flourished from twenty-eight to twenty-two centuries ago. A thousand years are as one day to Progress! Their second principle, that all words have come from monosyllabic roots, is rebuked by nearly every word in the American Indian's vocabulary. Monosyllabic words being first in use, and men being first savages, according to these wise men, it follows that the language of savages should be monosyllabic. Therefore, Minnesota, Minnehaha, Mississippi, Missouri and Chicago are monosyllables. Philology! How wonderfully prolific!

Scientific Chronicle.

THE PERFECTED PHONOGRAPH.

IN the "Chronicle" for last January we noticed the announcement made by Mr. Edison of a new and more perfect form of his phonograph. Since then, the details of the new instrument have been made public. Moreover, two other perfected forms of the same invention have been brought forward by rival inventors. The first of these is the Graphophone of Mr. Charles Sumner Tainter, a gentleman already well known as Mr. Bell's associate in some of the latter's most interesting investigations. The second is the Gramophone devised by Mr. Emile Berliner, who has won fame and fortune by originating the secondary circuit system of telephonic communication now in universal use. In all essential particulars, Edison's and Tainter's instruments are almost identical. Their object is to record the vibrations of articulate speech, and to reproduce the sounds at any future period, avoiding, at the same time, the defects of Edison's first phonograph. These defects consisted chiefly in a want of distinctness in the articulation of the reproduced sounds. This defect was so great that it was almost impossible to understand the reproduction unless the original sounds had been heard by the listener. Some consonants, too, were much less perfectly recorded than others. These imperfections were due to the intractable nature of the tin-foil used for receiving the indentations, and to the fact that the same diaphragm was employed both for receiving and reproducing the sounds. Moreover, the great delicacy of adjustment needed in the original instrument made its results very unsatisfactory, except in the hands of an expert manipulator. In remedying these defects, none of the rival inventors have made so radical a departure from the principle of the first phonograph as that suggested by the writer of our "Chronicle" for January. The suggestion there advanced is, that the voice be made to put in vibration a diaphragm which should cause small holes to be punctured in a sheet, metallic or otherwise, in a way similar to those made by the electric pen. Then a current of air passed through these holes successively would reproduce the sounds. This method seems worthy of trial. But Edison and Tainter have adhered strictly to the outlines of the original phonograph. A cylinder coated with a specially prepared and hardened wax, in place of the older tin-foil, is revolved by a small electric motor, or other means giving uniform motion. Just above the cylinder, a diaphragm is supported which holds, on its lower surface, a cutting blade instead of the needle of the old instrument. When the mouthpiece is spoken into, the vibrations of the diaphragm cause the blade to cut into the wax surface of the revolving cylinder. At the same time, by means of a screw, the diaphragm is advanced slowly in a

direction parallel to the length of the cylinder. The sound vibrations are thus recorded on the wax, in spiral lines, in the form of minute indentations. To reproduce the sound, the receiving diaphragm is replaced by one of much lighter material, bearing a light needle that rests delicately upon the indentations cut in the wax. As the cylinder is again made to revolve, the point of this needle passes over the former path made by the cutting blade, and its diaphragm consequently reproduces faithfully the sounds before uttered into the receiving mouthpiece. Although the instrument is greatly improved, still, some even scientific papers have, we think, been too extravagant in their praise. It is certain that no one would take the same pleasure in a piece of music repeated by the phonograph that he would in listening to the original. Still, some have indulged such fancies. The reproduced sound, moreover, is so faint that in order to hear it it is ordinarily necessary to make use of a tube leading from the mouthpiece to the ear.

Mr. Berliner has departed somewhat more widely from the type of Edison's first phonograph. He goes back to Léon Scott's *phonautograph*, the prototype of all instruments for recording sound vibrations. His stylus is a lever, pivoted at right angles to the diaphragm, and magnifying its vibrations in the record. In order to secure a really imperishable record, from which the sound may be repeated as often as desired, without impairing its perfection, Mr. Berliner substitutes for the receiving cylinder a zinc plate coated with soft wax. After the indentations corresponding to the sound vibrations have been impressed upon the wax coating by the stylus, the plate is immersed in a bath of chromic acid, which quickly etches the indentations into the zinc itself. There seems to be no reason why this method could not be applied equally well to the apparatus of Edison and Tainter. A cylinder of zinc, with the indentations etched upon its surface, would evidently form a much more durable record, and one much less liable to injury in the reproducing process than a cylinder merely coated with wax. Indeed, although Mr. Edison claims that "one of these wax blanks will repeat its contents thousands of times with undiminished clearness," we must be excused if we are somewhat incredulous. It is difficult to see how a surface that is so easily cut into by the blade of the receiving diaphragm should successfully resist even the slightest abrasion from the needle of the reproducing diaphragm, however light and delicately adjusted the latter may be. If, however, the zinc cylinder be objected to, or be found unlawful in consequence of the Berliner patents, would it not perhaps be possible to substitute for the wax some substance which, while receiving the indentations with equal facility, could afterwards, by immersion in some suitable reagent, be made to assume a strong or almost metallic consistency? Gelatine is an instance of a substance that hardens on immersion in a solution of alum. Of course it would not receive the indentations as well as the wax, but it suggests the possibility of an improvement in this direction. An electrotype can reproduce very fine lines—why not the minute marks on the wax cylinder? There are, it is true, many difficulties to be overcome in endeavors to improve the ma-

chine in this direction, but the value of the instrument would be so much enhanced that all the labor would be well repaid. Innumerable practical uses for the improved phonographs have been suggested and prophesied by the enthusiastic inventors. Most of these are probably more fanciful than practical. One, however, will undoubtedly prove of great importance, and will assure the instrument a fair sale from the very start. This is, to replace the stenographer in receiving all kinds of dictation, which may then be written out at leisure by the copyist, or with the aid of the type-writer. In this respect, the instrument will certainly prove itself far cheaper and at the same time more accurate and convenient than its human rival. In conclusion, we venture to assert that the "perfected" phonograph has not yet received all the perfection of which it is capable, and that, if a commercial future is once assured to it, hosts of inventors will invade the field offered by it for investigation and improvement.

MARS.

So much has been said of late in regard to the phenomena observed on Mars, that perhaps a brief review of the facts and theories may be of interest. The analogy between Mars and the Earth lends peculiar charm to all the inquiries into the physical condition of our planetary neighbor.

Mars is the next planet beyond the Earth in order of distance from the Sun, and at its most favorable oppositions is about 35,000,000 miles from us. In this position, however, very good views of the planet can be had, and, as far back as 1636, dark stains were observed on the ruddy disk of Mars. In 1666 they were seen with sufficient distinctness to serve as indices of the planet's rotation on its axis, which rotation Cassini determined as taking place in 24 h. and 40 m. But this time of rotation has since been corrected to 24 h. 37 m. 22.7 sec., while the dusky spots and streaks have been classified as oceans and straits, and the bright portions as land. That the surface of Mars is diversified by land and water we are reasonably certain. Moreover, two bright patches near the poles are supposed to be regions of snow. This conjecture is strengthened by the fact that they wax and wane with variations in the Martian seasons, as do the regions of snow on the Earth with variations in our seasons. Therefore, Mars must have an atmosphere containing clouds. The presence of aqueous vapor on Mars was, in fact, proved by Huggins in 1867, who found, while analyzing the light of the planet, the characteristic dark rays due to the absorptive action of water-vapor. Clouds, too, have been observed floating in the atmosphere of Mars, and at times these mists so blur the disk that the observer must daily, nay hourly, especially when the local winter prevails, trace the details of the surface through transits of clouds. The atmosphere in which these clouds are suspended is much thinner than ours, for, since the planet is smaller, gravity is less there than at the surface of the Earth. A man weighing

one hundred and fifty pounds here would weigh but sixty pounds there. The atmospheric covering, then, on Mars is much sparser, and its pressure about two and a quarter terrestrial pounds instead of fifteen. In 1877 Schiaparelli, director of the Milan Observatory, found that what were taken as large continents were, in many cases, groups of islands, separated from each other by a network of canals. In 1882 this same observer saw these same canals, but with this peculiarity, that many of them were seen in duplicate, that is, a twin canal ran parallel to the original one. These double canals have been seen by but one other observer, Mr. Perrotin, director of the Nice Observatory. He has traced three of them from the southern seas to the north polar regions, across land and sea. No one else has ever traced them so far through land and water, so that, if these observations are correct, many of the theories advanced to explain them must be abandoned. Mr. Fizeau refers these stripes to glacial action, and suggests that the stripes are cracks in huge masses of ice, seeing an analogy between them and the rifts in terrestrial glaciers. As the planet has a peculiar red color, there would certainly be some difficulty in accounting for the red color of these fields of ice. The temperature of the planet, too, is such, judging from the variations in the extent of the polar snows and ice, that these glaciers should melt. Why, then, do they remain? It is equally difficult to admit that they are water-ways or rivers, for, according to Perrotin, they flow on through the ocean as well as through the land. This same difficulty prevents the acceptance of Mr. Procter's explanation that these twin canals are diffraction-images of rivers, produced by the mist which hangs over the river-beds. But, before any of these theories are rejected, more extensive observations must be made. The difficulty of the work may be gathered from the fact that maps constructed on the observations of reliable astronomers agree in but a very few special features. We looked, naturally, to our great Lick telescope to settle some of these points. Owing, however, to necessary delays in completing the observatory, no observations could be made until the middle of July. By this time the best season for watching the planet, namely, April and May, had passed; but, from the middle of July to the end of August Mars was carefully followed; the canals were seen, but there was no evidence of their being double. The story told by the Lick telescope is no doubt reliable, for it has shown its great power of penetrating the secrets of the heavens by following the details on Mars two months later than other instruments. Another startling disclosure made by Mr. Perrotin with regard to Mars was the submergence of the continent Libya. Later, however, he stated that the sea had receded, leaving the continent only partially submerged. Professor Holden, with his great telescope, found the continent as he had observed it all along since 1877. So that if any change had taken place, which seems doubtful, it certainly left Libya unaltered. That there are peculiar stripes on Mars is clear from the observations of so many astronomers, and that these stripes vary, appear and disappear, is also evident from the variations in the observations. How, then, account for these changes? The theory that presents the least difficulty

is, that they are due to differences in vegetation. The stripes may represent patches of vegetation which vary in size, or disappear with changes in the seasons. From ascertained facts, the surface of Mars is composed of land and water; the planet has snow, clouds, rain, an atmosphere, and a temperature not much less than ours. All these conditions are favorable to the growth of organic life; moreover, the spectroscope teaches us that the elements in Mars are the same as our own. Hence it is highly probable that there is a rich vegetation on Mars. Now, if the changes in the stripes are due to variations in the vegetation, they should follow some rule, they should be guided by the seasons and be somewhat progressive from the equator towards the poles. Such a change has been observed in the patch known as Hades. The stripe is in north latitude, and runs almost north and south. As Mr. Pickering, of the Harvard Observatory, has pointed out, the southern portion of Hades, which had been a well-defined stripe, entirely disappeared in the latter part of the Martian summer. We look forward, however, to other observations to settle these interesting questions, and expect the large telescope on Mount Hamilton to bring to light many details during the opposition of 1890, and the more favorable one of 1892.

A NEW THEORY OF SPECTRUM ANALYSIS.

THE "Chronicle" for April, 1888, gives a short description of the principles of spectrum analysis, and points out the wide field open to the spectroscopist who wishes to investigate the simple character of our chemical elements. Professor Grünwald, of Prague, whose work has been in this direction, has established a law which, by its simplicity and the number of coincidences, cannot fail to attract attention, and may become the basis of a future mathematico-chemical analysis. He has not only determined a relation between the spectra of hydrogen and oxygen, and their compound water, but has brought out what appears to be the fact of the chemical composition of hydrogen and oxygen, and the separate existence of the elements of hydrogen in the atmosphere of the sun. To understand the theory, let us suppose two elements, *A* and *B*, capable of forming a gas *C*. When the gas *C* is examined by the spectroscope, there will be certain wave-lengths of light, due to the element *A*. If, however, the compound gas *C* be united chemically with some other substance, so as to form a second compound, *D*, which will contain *A*, but in a way different from that in which *C* contained it, the spectrum of *D* will also have wave-lengths of light due to *A*. The wave-lengths of light due to *A*, in both these cases, are not the same, but bear to each other the same ratio as the atomic volume of *A* in *C* bears to the atomic volume of *A* in *D*. Professor Grünwald detects in the spectrum of hydrogen two groups of lines so arranged that the wave-lengths of one group multiplied by $\frac{1}{3}\frac{8}{8}$, and those of the other by $\frac{4}{5}$, give the wave-lengths of the corresponding lines in the water-vapor

spectrum. Hence, he concludes that hydrogen is composed of two elements. If, then, a and b represent the volumes of these two elements, $a + b = 1$, the unit volume of hydrogen; and since hydrogen is $\frac{2}{3}$ of the atomic volume of water-vapor, we have, according to the theory, $\frac{1}{3}a + \frac{2}{3}b = \frac{2}{3}$. From these two equations, $a = \frac{1}{3}$, and $b = \frac{2}{3}$; therefore, hydrogen is a compound of $b a$, which, on separation, will expand in the ratio of 3 to 2. The spectrum of these two elements can be obtained from the spectra of hydrogen. Multiplying the wave-lengths in group a by $\frac{3}{2}$ we obtain the line for a , and in a similar way we find the line for b . Professor Grünwald has identified the line for b with the Helium line of Angstrom's scale, and the line for a with the corona line of Kirchhoff's map. Hence, he suggests that these two constituent elements of hydrogen be called "Coronium" and "Helium." The primary element, "Coronium," must be a gas several times lighter than hydrogen. It is a strange coincidence that just as Professor Grünwald's theory was proposed, another law should be deduced from a different source, demanding the existence of elements such as the new theory of spectrum analysis points out. This new law is the logarithmic law of the atomic weights. It was explained by Dr. Johnstone Stoney to the members of the chemical section at the late meeting of the British Association. If, as seems likely, this is a law of nature, there must be three elements lighter than hydrogen. By like considerations to those given above, Professor Grünwald found that oxygen was made up of the hydrogen that gives the second spectrum, already mentioned, and another substance which he resolves into four parts, by volume, of b , and five parts of another substance which is again resolved into four parts of b , and an unknown primary substance, c . He has also resolved magnesium and carbon into b and c . This theory is startling, and although not yet fully investigated, still throws some suspicion on the simple character of hydrogen and our other elementary substances.

THE THEORY OF ELECTRO-MAGNETISM.

To explain the action of two electrified bodies upon each other physicists have, for a long time, been divided into two camps; the one, seeing in electrical attraction and repulsion a confirmation of the doctrine of action at a distance, the other as strenuously advocating the necessity and therefore the existence of a medium. There was no empirical proof of the existence of such a medium for electricity. Since light takes eight minutes to come from the sun to the earth, a medium must be admitted to explain what becomes of the light after leaving the sun and before reaching the earth. But electro-magnetic induction was, as far as we could see, instantaneous, and even where there was delay, as in telegraphing and in magneto-electric transmission by means of conductors, the supporters of action at a distance gave an explanation. Something further, then, was required to settle the question. As all doubt about

a medium for light was banished by the experiments of Young and Fresnel, so, too, the experiments lately made by Hertz, in Germany, settle the question for electro-magnetic action ; for, if the phenomena of the interference of light demand a medium, assuredly the interference of electro-magnetic waves, as observed by Hertz, postulates a medium in which these waves exist. The German physicist produced rapidly alternating currents, having a wave length of about two metres. These he detected by the principle of resonance, a principle illustrated by the fact that regular well-timed pushes with the finger against a heavy bell will, after a short time, cause it to swing through a large arc. Hertz then made a circuit whose rate of vibration for electric currents was the same as that of his generator. His generator induced currents in this resonant circuit, and he was able to see the sparks due to the induced vibrations leaping across an air-space in the resonant circuit. The regular electrical impulses broke down the resistance of the air, as the regular pushes on the bell overcame its inertia. He placed his generator several wave-lengths from a wall, and placed the receiving resonant circuit between the generator and the wall, and in this air-space observed that sparks appeared and disappeared at regular intervals, due to the interference of the incident electric waves, and those reflected from the wall. We have a similar phenomenon in light, known as Lloyd's bands, due to the interference of direct and reflected waves of light. By this experiment the ethereal theory of electro-magnetism is established, and it becomes clear that electro-magnetic actions are due to a medium pervading all space, the same medium, in fact, by which light-waves are propagated. This is likely but the first step in a series of investigations that may throw light on the constitution of the ether. To it we may have to look for an explanation of chemical action, and, possibly, of gravitation. This discovery will, undoubtedly, have a practical bearing. In all known illuminating processes, there is with the generation of light a simultaneous generation of a great amount of heat, which, as far as illuminating purposes are concerned, is lost. We look forward, then, to the experiments of the many scientists who have taken up this line of investigation for a practical method of generating light without the simultaneous production of a large amount of useless heat.

Book Notices.

NARRATIVE AND CRITICAL HISTORY OF AMERICA. With Bibliographical and Descriptive Essays on its Historical Sources and Authorities. Illustrated. Vols. II., III. and IV. Edited by *Justin Winsor*, Librarian of Harvard University, Corresponding Secretary of Massachusetts Historical Society. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. The Riverside Press, Cambridge.

Under this title Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. have commenced the publication of what they propose shall be "a complete and exhaustive history of the American Continent," from prehistoric times to the middle of the present century. The work is to be comprised in eight royal octavo volumes of about six hundred pages each, and is profusely illustrated with maps, views, portraits and fac-simile reproductions of historical documents.

In addition to the claims which the magnitude of the undertaking and the importance of the subject and the ability of the writers employed have upon public attention, it is believed by the projectors of the work that these claims, strong though they be, are overshadowed by the surpassing excellence of the *method* that has been adopted.

The method referred to bears the same relation to history which "the inductive method of Bacon and the comparative method in the applied sciences do to present scientific and philosophic progress," and which the projectors of the work before us think "have revolutionized civilization." They claim for their work that it "embodies a *true* method of historical investigation." Inasmuch, too, as the "labor of research in covering even a very limited period of history, precludes the possibility of doing full justice" to it by any one individual, they have adopted the "*co-operative*" plan.

In carrying this idea into practical effect the work has been placed under the editorial supervision of Mr. Justin Winsor, Librarian of Harvard University, etc., assisted by a committee of five distinguished members of the Massachusetts Historical Society, who have consented to advise with the editor during the progress of the work. Each special subject is assigned by the editor to a historical writer who, it is believed by him, is eminently qualified to treat it. The different chapters, as a rule, consist of two parts: First, a *Historical Narrative* sufficiently full for ordinary use, and which groups the salient points of the story, and serves as a text or essay which follows it. Second, a *Critical Essay*, which is intended to describe "the original sources of the preceding narrative—manuscripts, monuments, archæological remains, with accounts of their discovery, their transmission to later times, their vicissitudes, as well as the places, libraries, museums, etc., where they are to be found; the writers, contemporary, early, or late, who have become authorities on the several subjects; and a critical statement of existing knowledge" on these subjects, etc.

It is thought that the bias of each narrator will be corrected by the critical analysis of the essay. Each statement, too, of fact or opinion, must pass under the scrutiny of the Editor, who submits debateable questions to an advisory committee. In this way, it is believed, error

will be reduced to a minimum and truth will be approached as closely as possible.

We have described the plan adopted and the expectations and claims which the projectors of the work have based upon it at such length, because of the extent and importance of the field of knowledge which it is proposed the work shall include, and also because it is the first attempt, we believe, by means of the proposed method to get up a comprehensive, complete, and reliable history of the American Continent. The method is claimed to be entirely new. We are not prepared to concede this, without qualification. It may be new as regards the extent and comprehensiveness of the conception, but it is not new with respect to the idea of compiling history by the combined labors of historical writers, each working upon a special subject. But this, after all, is of small importance compared with the success itself of the plan.

With regard to this we should be more than doubtful from a consideration of the plan itself. Mere induction, even in the physical sciences, is incomplete and leads to no real conclusions unless it is joined with and supplemented by deduction. So, too, it is, and in a higher degree, in the domain of history. Synthesis must necessarily supplement analysis, in every true rational process. The inductive or analytic method rigidly adhered to in historical investigations will give us facts, but not their true relation or moral significance. It will enable the investigator to compile a chronicle but not a history.

There is a serious danger, too, that the person who undertakes to rigidly adhere to the inductive method alone—contemning and abnegating that of deduction—will unconsciously and without proper care as to his logical processes employ that of deduction, and substitute unproved hypotheses for true conclusions. To this danger persons who essay this one-sided method of ratiocination almost invariably succumb, without themselves being aware of it. For the man who imagines that he can employ solely the inductive method in his investigations of any subject, is most liable to be influenced by preconceived notions. This is the *proton pseudos*, the primary, fundamental fallacy of many of the so-called scientists of our day. The reason of it is plain. No one can think correctly or reach true conclusions who does not observe and follow out the law of all right-thinking. And to think rightly and truly requires not only analysis but synthesis, not only induction but also deduction.

These conclusions are verified in volumes II., III. and IV. of the work before us, the only volumes that have yet been published. The writers on the special subjects which each one has treated, and ably treated, give in most instances brief chronicles, and in other, but fewer, instances, essays, rather than histories. Giving them, too, as we do, full credit for honesty of intention and a resolute purpose to be impartial, we can yet plainly perceive in their manner of treating their special subjects, marks of personal bias, growing out of preconceived opinions, or prejudices resulting from the schools of thought of which they are respectively adherents.

We make these remarks not at all for the purpose of detracting from the actual and great value of the work—for to historical students it is of very great value—but in order to guard our readers from disappointment through their indulging in expectations which are based upon erroneous conceptions; and also in order to point out in what the true and really great value of the work consists.

That value, in our judgment, is not so much in the *narrative* part of the different chapters—for in that part of very many of them we frankly confess we have been disappointed—but in the "*critical*" part of each

chapter and its accompanying notes, etc., giving the sources of information, and historical authorities; illustrated as they are profusely, with cuts and fac-similes of ancient monuments, documents, archæological remains, etc., etc. For this reason the work is of exceeding value to searchers into the original sources of American history. To these it will be an almost indispensable aid.

That our readers may be acquainted with the fulness and comprehensiveness of the intended scope of the work, we give, as fully as the limits of our space will permit, its plan in detail. The first volume will contain papers on "America before Columbus," with bibliographical and descriptive essays on historical sources and authorities. The publication of this volume, very prudently and properly, is postponed until all the other volumes shall have been published in order that full advantage may be taken of investigations now progressing in the field of American Archæology.

Volumes II., III. and IV., which have been published and are now before us, treat respectively of "Spanish Discoveries and Conquests in America," with "Bibliographical and Descriptive Essays on Historical Sources and Authorities; on English Discoveries and Settlements in America," with like "Bibliographical and Descriptive Essays;" and on "The French Discoveries and Settlements in America," and those also of the Dutch and the Swedes, and with like "Bibliographical and Descriptive Essays."

Volumes VI., VII. and VIII. are yet to be published, at intervals of six months. Their respective subjects will be: "The French and English in North America, from the English Revolution to the Peace of Paris, 1689-1763." "The American Revolution, 1763-1783." "The United States, 1783-1850," "Canada, and the American Outgrowths of Continental Europe, Dependent and Independent, in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries."

Each chapter in each of these volumes will have, in addition to its narrative part, "Bibliographical, Descriptive, and Critical Essays on the Historical Sources and Authorities."

It is probably too late to change the scope and plan of these latter four volumes. But if not, we would suggest that the work close for the present with the end of the eighteenth century, instead of continuing down to 1850. This latter date is too near our own day, and too closely connected with it, to permit of a comprehensive and impartial survey and exhibition of the subject. However, even though the narrative of this period should be unduly tinged with the coloring of our own times, the collection and arrangement of historical sources and authorities which the volumes dealing with the first part of this century will contain, will make them valuable to students of history.

To return to the volumes before us: The seventh chapter in volume III. seems to us entirely out of place in a work of this kind. It is not historical, except in a most distant and remote way. Under the form of a disquisition on "The Religious Element in the Settlement of New England," and "The Puritans and Separatists in New England," it is an elaborate sectarian apology for them. On the same grounds on which this paper has been introduced into the work, we might reasonably expect to find, but do not find, separate disquisitions on the tenets of the Friends as a religious element in the settlement of Pennsylvania, or the tenets of the Baptists as a religious element in the settlement of Rhode Island, and on those of Catholics in the settlement of Maryland.

Still more incongruous with the calm judicial spirit which should characterize a work such as this aims to be, is the so called Historical

Narrative on "Las Casas, and the Relations of the Spaniards to the Indians," by Rev. George Edward Ellis, D.D., LL.D., President of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and one of the advisory committee to the editor. It is not, in any proper sense, either historical or narrative. It is a sensational, highly-colored sketch of the gentleness and amiability of the Indians, and their cruel treatment by Spanish adventurers, contrasted with the humane labors of Las Casas. It is full of rhetorical exaggerations, and of evidences of the personal bias and *odium theologicum* of the writer. Lest this judgment be thought too sweeping, we give a few specimens (from many more that might be quoted) of the writer's statements and language. Nor are they selected for a purpose, but taken as they meet the eye in turning over the pages. The early Spanish settlers are characterized—not individually, but as a class and without distinction—as "murderers, rapacious, cruel, and inhuman;" as having "inflicted upon hundreds of thousands of the natives all the forms and agonies of fiendish cruelty." This, too, is explained "by referring to the training of the Spanish nature in inhumanity, cruelty, contempt of human life, and obduracy of feeling, through many centuries of ruthless warfare," which "had made every Spaniard a fighter, and every infidel an enemy exempted from all tolerance and mercy. Treachery, defiance of pledges and treaties, had educated the champions of the Cross and Faith in what were to them but the accomplishments of the soldier and the fidelity of the believer." "The Holy Office of the Inquisition, with all its cavernous secrets and fiendish processes, dates also from the same period, and gave its fearful consecration to all the most direful passions." "With training in inhumanity and cruelty, the Spanish adventurers," etc., "thousands of the natives" were "crowded together, naked and helpless, for slaughter, like sheep in a park or meadow." They were "wasted at the extremities by torturing fires, till, after hours of agony, they turned their dying gaze, rather in amazed dread than in rage, upon their tormentors," etc.

All this, too, contrasts strikingly and broadly with the manner in which, in other papers, the needlessly cruel conduct of the early settlers of Massachusetts and Connecticut, towards the Indians of those regions, is lightly touched upon or left unmentioned, and also with the omission to describe the piratical outrages of English adventurers upon Spanish settlements.

There are other "narratives" in the volume before us which we think are open to like objections of personal or sectarian bias, but in a less degree than those we have mentioned. Nor can we abstain from expressing our regret for the partial and one-sided view that is taken of the character and conduct of Columbus in the "narrative" of his life and discoveries. So, too, we cannot but think that the insinuation that Catholics hold that "no faith is to be kept with heretics;" the characterizing "the Jesuits" as "diplomatic and insidious;" the styling of the Catholic religion "popery," and other like expressions, are entirely out of place in a work of such high pretensions. They naturally create a strong presumption against the impartiality and reliability of the writers who employ them. They certainly are grave defects, and seriously detract from the value of many of the narratives. It is to be hoped that they will be carefully guarded against in the volumes that are still to be published.

Yet, notwithstanding these defects, and referring more particularly to the bibliographical and critical papers, with their copious notes and illustrations (which we think are by far the most important), we regard the work, taking it as a whole, as the most systematic and painstaking at-

tempt that has yet been made to compile and publish a comprehensive history of the Western Continent. The bibliographical and critical essays, and their numerous references to historical authorities and documents, and other original sources of information, will furnish invaluable assistance to those who wish to thoroughly study American history.

THE AMERICAN COMMONWEALTH. By *James Bryce*. 2 volumes. London and New York: McMillan & Co. 1888.

"The longer any one studies a vast subject, the more cautious in inference does he become." This sentence, taken from the midst of the introductory chapter of the work before us, is the terse expression of a principle which it would be well for all writers to bear in mind and to adopt for their own guidance; then the reading world might be supplied with fewer ready-made judgments that are, for the most part, erroneous. Our author professes to have followed it in writing his latest work. "I have striven," he says, "to avoid the temptations of the deductive method, and to present simply the facts of the case, arranging and connecting them as best I can, but letting them speak for themselves rather than pressing upon the reader my own conclusions." And because Americans, writing of the history and institutions of the United States, have almost invariably ignored this principle, the best works on our country, its political, industrial and social institutions, have been written by foreigners. Even Bancroft impairs the usefulness of his great work by his evident purpose, implied on almost every page, of stating facts only for the sake of making them support the false theory that liberty is an essential outgrowth of Protestantism. No doubt, the vast majority of books about us, written by Europeans, especially the French and English, are worthless, worse than useless; but yet De Tocqueville wrote the first really valuable appreciation of us, and his *Democracy in America* still remains a standard work, though composed according to a preconceived notion of what, in the writer's judgment, we ought to be, rather than of what our ancestors actually were in his day. At least two other European writers have judged us according to justice, Herr von Holst in Germany, and M. Claudio Jannet in France, the latter being one of the glories of Catholic literature, who is far from being as well known in this country as he ought to be.

If for no other reason than that implied in the two sentences we have quoted, Mr. Bryce's book is superior to De Tocqueville's, though it is, by no means, free from errors of statement, enough of which to fill a page or two we could cull after but a cursory examination. In treating, for instance, of our Presidential election, he says that, on account of the obscurity of the candidates for electors, the name of a party's candidate for the Presidency is printed at the head of the ballots, while the fact is that such intimation to voters is really an exception to the rule. But, far more serious, in our view, are his references to Catholics and to religious liberty in the colonies and the States. At the time of the Revolution, he says (vol. i. p. 21), all the inhabitants of the revolted colonies or new States, "except some Roman Catholics in Maryland, professed the Protestant religion." What, then, of the thousands of Catholics at that time living in Delaware, Pennsylvania and New Jersey? And what warranty has he for asserting (vol. ii. p. 567) that the creed of Roman Catholic Bishops "justifies the enforcement of the true faith by the secular arm?" This statement is the more astonishing, as Mr. Bryce is usually fair in his treatment of Catholics, with whose disabilities in the State of New Hampshire, however, he has not made himself, by

any means, so well acquainted as with most of the other subjects of which he treats in these two volumes.

But, in general, he carries out admirably the plan which he drew up for himself, when undertaking to write this book, the presenting of a general view of the United States, both as a government and as a nation. And his treatment is comprehensive, but not, of course, exhaustive. The latter course would lead the writer "to descant as fully upon matters he knows imperfectly, as upon those with which his own tastes and knowledge qualify him to deal." Accordingly, while passing lightly over some things, he endeavors "to omit nothing which seems necessary to make the political life and the national character and tendencies of the Americans intelligible to Europeans"; and, with this view he touches "upon some topics only distantly connected with government or politics." He spent nearly twenty years in studying his subject, and during that period he visited this country three times, and of these visits he tells us himself: "When I first visited America eighteen years ago, I brought home a swarm of bold generalizations. Half of them were thrown overboard in 1881. Of the half that remained, some were dropped into the Atlantic when I returned across it, after a third visit in 1883-84; and, although the two later journeys gave birth to some new views, these views are fewer and more discreetly cautious than their departed sisters of 1870. I can honestly say," he adds, contrasting his own with De Tocqueville's plan, "that I shall be far better pleased, if readers of a philosophic turn find in the book matter on which they feel they can safely build theories for themselves, than if they take from it theories ready made."

In these two volumes, of nearly seven hundred pages each, there is ample food for years of reflection. They are almost entirely devoted to a description of the facts of to-day. Mr. Bryce takes pains to tell us that, in carrying out his plan, he has had to resist the temptation of straying off into history; but he has written history nevertheless, for Freeman's *dictum* is strictly true, that politics is present history, history in the ordinary sense being past politics. Our author makes one brief historical diversion, but it is only because he found it necessary to do so in order to clear the way for a proper understanding of our political system, of which he has evidently made a thorough study. But even without history he naturally found his subject a vast and complex one; yet he has managed to arrange its component parts according to a plan which is not only logical in its order, but makes the reading of the book entertaining as well as useful.

"There are three main things," he says, "that one wishes to know about a national commonwealth, namely, its framework and constitutional machinery, the methods by which it is worked, the forces which move it and direct its course. It is natural to begin with the first of these. Accordingly, I begin with the government." And in the first of the six parts into which he divides his work, he describes the national government in all its branches, executive, legislative and judiciary; in the second, the State governments in the same manner; in the third, our system of political parties, and in the fourth the bearing of public opinion upon the system; while in the fifth part he gives illustrations and makes reflections, and in the sixth deals with our social institutions, including therein the strength and influence of religion in the United States. This we consider the least thorough and least satisfactory part of the work. Necessarily, some repetition was involved in the faithful carrying out of this plan; but a little repetition was better than the leaving of some topics in comparative obscurity. The evils of our sys-

tem, especially in municipal government, are pointed out in a good, not a carping, spirit, which should inspire our legislators with a keen sense of the necessity of correcting abuses that not only tend to the blunting of public and civic virtue at home, but also to the depreciating among foreigners of our entire system. Especially are the corruptions of New York and Philadelphia politics dwelt upon for this purpose. Valuable documents, illustrative of the more important chapters, are given in copious appendices to both volumes.

Mr. Bryce assures us that he has found it so easy to be non-partisan in his treatment of our country that, after reading his pages, we find it difficult to conceive how most foreign books about us are imbued throughout with the spirit of prejudice. He says that, in the first place, he wrote down what struck him as the dominant facts, and then tested, by consulting American friends and studying American books, the view which he had reached. He also claims to have discovered the cause why such a book as his has not been written by an American, who might naturally be supposed to have great advantages over a stranger. But, after mature reflection, the conclusion is naturally reached that "there are two advantages which a stranger, or at least a stranger who is also an Englishman, with some practical knowledge of English politics and English law, may hope to secure." What these advantages are, we will leave to Mr. Bryce himself to state, submitting his description as a fair sample of his literary style. Such a writer "is struck by some things which a native does not think of explaining, because they are too obvious, and whose influence on politics or society he forgets to estimate, since they seem to him part of the order of nature. And the stranger finds it easier to maintain a position of detachment, detachment not only from party prejudice, but from those prepossessions in favor of persons, groups, constitutional dogmas, national pretensions, which a citizen can scarcely escape except by falling into the attitude of impartial cynicism which sours and perverts the historical mind as much as prejudice itself."

Following these lines, Mr. Bryce has produced a book which leaves both Americans and English-speaking foreigners without an excuse for hereafter remaining in ignorance of our institutions and mode of life. How he has accomplished his task he himself describes in this pen-picture: "He who regards a wide landscape from a distant height, sees its details imperfectly, and must unfold his map in order to make out where each village lies, and how the roads run from point to point. But he catches the true perspective of things better than if he were standing among them. The great features of the landscape, the valleys, slopes and mountains, appear in their relative proportion; he can estimate the height of the peaks and the breadth of the plains."

THE TRUE SPOUSE OF JESUS CHRIST. With an Appendix and various Small Works and Spiritual Letters. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. In two volumes, forming part of the Centenary Edition of the Complete Works of St. Alphonsus. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Bros., Printers to the Apostolic See.

The good that men do, the poet has said, is not interred with their bones. Fortunately for the world, the law is universal. It were, indeed, sad for the world if such had not been the case, and if the works of great and good men did not live after them to remind and teach us "how to make our lives sublime." Pre-eminently sad would it have been, and greatly to be deplored, if the works of St. Alphonsus de Liguori, the

crystallization of his wisdom and piety, had not been handed down to us. They may not, indeed, have made sublime the lives of all who have read them, but they have undoubtedly influenced them for good, and tended to draw them nearer to God, and thus have made men better and holier. Whether it be in the domain of theology or of asceticism that we consider the Saint, great is the good he has done, and is doing to the believing world. Few are the Church's illustrious sons, revered worthily and beloved though they be, whose memory is so cherished and revered as is that of St. Alphonsus. Many are the theological works that have been written since his day, yet to the great treatise on Moral Theology which bears his name we turn with a pleasure and profit that others with all their merits fail to give us. It is like going to the fountain-head, where the waters are coolest and clearest, instead of drinking of them after they have flowed along their channels for many a league, and lost their freshness and limpid purity. And, as with his great work on Moral Theology, so with his ascetical writings. Though old, they seem ever new, ever fresh and vigorous, ever instructive. Like the Church herself, whose spirit they breathe, they shine forth clearer and stronger with the advancing years.

In a special way these words are applicable to the work before us, "The True Spouse of Jesus Christ." It is some years now since this work was first given to the public in an English translation. From the beginning, its high worth was appreciated. It was doubly precious. It was precious for its own intrinsic value, and precious for its timeliness, supplying, as it did, a long-felt want in the lives of Religious in this country and other English-speaking countries.

The edition before us constitutes the tenth and eleventh volumes of "The Centennary Edition" of the Saint's works. It has been edited with great care and conspicuous ability. Though "The True Spouse of Jesus Christ" was written expressly for Nuns, it contains also much that is profitable and needful, not only for all classes of Religious, but for those also who live in the world. No one, in whatever calling in life, can read it and fail to profit by it. But to those who, in the Religious life, have given themselves to God, the work is particularly addressed. It aims at a portrayal of the *true* Spouse of Jesus Christ.

That for such a work St. Alphonsus was eminently and peculiarly fitted no one can reasonably deny. He was a Religious, day in and day out, specially consecrated to God. He was the founder of a Religious Order; a man, moreover, of unusual attainments, and of large experience in the guidance of Religious souls. He knew the ideal which the Church has set before her Religious. He knew also, from intimate relations with that part of Christ's kingdom, the obstacles which stood in the way of the attainment of that ideal, as well as the helps that aided its realization.

In the opening chapters of his work, he speaks of the excellence of the Religious state and its advantages. He treats this from a two-fold point of view; first, showing from Scriptural citations the preciousness of virginity in the sight of God, and, secondly, its suitableness and favorableness to a perfect service of God in this world. This second point he brings out most clearly by referring to St. Paul, who, speaking on the same subject, says that the unmarried woman and the virgin "thinketh that she may be holy both in body and spirit, but she that is married thinketh on the things of the world and how she may please her husband." The Religious state is, in the words of the Saint, as it is in the estimation of all earnest, thoughtful men, the surest way to salvation.

Not that the Saint says or thinks that all who enter into that state shall be saved—for he admits, and plainly says, that it has its dangers and pitfalls—but because of the protection with which it is hedged around and the special graces with which God blesses it.

Having treated of the excellence of the Religious life from this two-fold point of view, the Saint gives us his idea of a true Spouse of Christ. The espousal of the Religious he holds to be a true and perfect espousal, a solemn consecration of one's-self to God, a becoming thereby one with Him; one heart, and mind, and soul, wholly and entirely His. The true spouse of Jesus Christ will, therefore, be in heart and will, in thought, and word, and deed, in her whole life, a copy of her Master. His ways, then, will be her ways; His virtues her virtues.

Carrying out that thought, St. Alphonsus devotes most of the subsequent part of his work to a consideration of the virtues which so eminently befit a Religious, and without which she cannot be what she professes and aspires to be—a true spouse of Jesus Christ. There must be, he tells us, interior mortification; there must also be exterior mortification. The true Religious can have no will. For where there is self-will there is also self-love, and consequently not an entire giving up of self to God. On the humility both of heart and intellect, which Religious must possess; on the fraternal charity which must ever guide them in their dealings with mankind; on the patience that must possess their souls; of the great necessity of mental prayer—needful to a Religious as air is to life—St. Alphonsus dwells with great clearness and force.

There are some who think the Saint has gone too far into details, and that it would have been better had he not treated upon some matters to which he has drawn attention. But this is a grave mistake. Men are not angels; and sensible mortals do not look for perfection in this life. If, in the past, Religious have not been all that they ought to have been, it is for us to learn from their shortcomings that our duty is higher. This work of St. Alphonsus is estimated at its true value by those to whom it is especially addressed—the Religious in our convents—and, if there be one thing more than another for which it is prized, it is because the Saint lays his finger upon their weaknesses, and, having done so, points out to them the way to overcome such obstacles to the attainment of God's perfect love. Not the least valuable part of the work is the appendix, covering more than three hundred pages of the second volume. For the most part it contains Exhortations addressed to the nuns of Religious communities, and Spiritual Letters written to Religious and persons called to a Religious state. They are full of sweetness and wisdom, and we are sure will be fully appreciated by all who are in earnest in the work of saving their souls, and especially by those who have consecrated themselves to God, and are desirous of being His loyal, loving, and true spouses.

Readers should ever bear in mind that the author is a Saint, and therefore his words and counsels are deserving of far more than common interest. To what extent God inspired the Saint in writing this work, is not given us to know, but we feel we are not going beyond the truth when we say that it must have been the fruit of many prayers, and of much communion with God. The work, therefore, should be in the hands of all who seek perfection, who love God, and wish to dwell with Him hereafter. It will draw them nearer to God, teach them to walk in His perfect ways; it will be to them a lamp in the darkness, and a staff in their weakness.

THEOLOGIAE DOGMATICÆ COMPENDIUM IN USUM STUDIOSORUM THEOLOGIAE.
 Tomus I. Edidit S. Hurter, S. J., S. Theolog. et Philos. Doctor, Ejusdem
 S. Theolog. in C. R. Universitate (Enipontana Professore P. O. Cum Approba-
 tione Celsissimi et Reverendissimi Episcopi Brixinensis et Facultate Superiorum.
 Editio Sexta Aucta et Emendata. (Eniponte Libraria Academica Wagneriana.
 1888.

That the excellence of Father Hurter's work has been appreciated we have undoubted proof in the fact that the volume before us is the first of a new and sixth edition. The Rev. Father tells us, and from a perusal of the volume it becomes quite evident, that he has taken advantage of the present edition to enlarge and correct his work.

We have not here the space to attempt a broad and thorough criticism of this admirable book. We do not claim for it the highest excellence. There are works on the same subject which we prefer. Still it must be admitted that Father Hurter's book holds a highly respectable position among works of that kind. His treatment of the great question of Divine Revelation is especially worthy of commendation. It is quite thorough and searching in its clear and exact examination and elucidation of the subject. Nor does Father Hurter fail to give satisfaction in that part of his book which is devoted to the exposition of the nature and foundation and claims of the Church. Here his work is strong.

Whilst the plan and general treatment of this part of his book are open to criticism and have undoubtedly evoked honest objection, and, to our mind, are inferior to the work of Mazella on the same subject, we must however bear testimony that the Rev. author has performed his task with far more than ordinary success. Upon the question of the Church's prerogatives, as well as of those which pertain to her Visible Head, he is clear and sound. The great truth of the infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff of the Church he treats ably and learnedly. Of course upon this truth he throws no new light. The arguments he adduces are familiar to all students of theology. But in this there can be no reasonable ground for disappointment. In the treatment of this great and important subject by theologians of our day, what we look for is clearness of exposition and soundness of argument, and both of these we have in Father Hurter's treatise.

Incidentally in the treatment of the subject the Rev. author speaks of the timeliness of the Church's definition of the dogma. This has been from the beginning a vexed question. Great and good men have been on the one side, and great and good men on the other. Our author takes the ground that the time had come for the Church to speak out clearly and authoritatively on the subject. Whether the great minds of our age agree with him in this view of the question, matters not. At most it is now a mere problem or theory. For the Church's solemn declaration has practically ended the question. Our duty is plain.

The fourth and concluding part of the work before us the Rev. author devotes to the subject of faith. He treats it from a threefold aspect: First, from that of man believing; second, the relation between faith and knowledge; and third, the rule of faith in the concrete. To the exposition of these three our author devotes many pages. There is no denying that the subject of faith is a subtle one and demands of him who essays to enter deeply into it unusual ability. We feel sure that Father Hurter has performed his difficult task in a way that must be eminently satisfactory to students of theology. He is always clear, always safe. In doubtful issues he is always on the side of the great Doctors of the Church.

We can, therefore, safely commend Father Hurter's work. As a

text-book it may not be all we could desire, but the student of theology will ever find it a safe and trustworthy guide.

Sometimes we hear it said, and by those, too, who know whereof they speak, that devotion and practical morality are losing ground and are not near what they ought to be. May not this sad fact be attributable to the scant knowledge men have of God and their faith? Dogma is undoubtedly the source of devotion, and knowledge is love. What I do not know, I cannot love. Not knowing God as they should and having scarcely a faint notion, even, of the beauties of their faith, we cannot expect men to be other than they are. What they want is more dogma, more knowledge of God, a clearer insight into the beauties of their faith. With such works as Father Hurter's at command, our clergymen will be better equipped, and consequently better able to instruct our people. Hence the great good and high value of sound and trustworthy works on Dogmatic Theology.

GOD KNOWABLE AND KNOWN. By Rev. *Maurice Ronayne, S. J.*, Author of "Religion and Science." New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1888.

The purpose of this book is to furnish, to persons willing to think, arguments that bear on the existence and knowableness of God. The author frankly and modestly disclaims having either invented or discovered the arguments he presents. He says, and truly, that in their general outlines they have been before the human mind during all ages. But those arguments are just as available at present, in the warfare with infidelity, as in any period of the past, and they need only, as it were, to be refurbished anew, that they may be perfectly well fitted for modern use. To give the reasoning greater point and to answer various objections, the author has cast a great part of the arguments into the form of discussions. The places, times, and persons in these discussions have been feigned in order to give more vivid and practical reality to the arguments. The work is opportune as dealing with questions which, especially at this time, are earnestly debated. Its method, too, and arrangement of topics are highly judicious. The arguments are presented in a form that is free from all needless technicality, and the language in which they are expressed is as simple as the nature of the questions discussed will permit.

In pursuance of his plan the author very properly commences with showing that all nature witnesses to God. He shows from the very nature of matter itself—the fact that it is finite and contingent—that it requires, to account for its existence, the existence of an independent, absolute, self-existing, first cause. He then answers the various objections of those who assert that matter is uncreated, and proves that their different objections, almost without exception, involve the logical error of first assuming as undeniable the very point they are required to prove and then building upon it as though it had been conceded. He passes in review the ideas on this subject of Darwin, Herbert Spencer, Huxley, Mill, Hamilton, Locke and Hume, tracing them back to ancient Greek and Roman sophists and exposing their fallacies.

The second chapter treats the very important subject, "The Data of Natural Knowledge." The third, fourth, and fifth chapters, respectively, have to do with "God our Creator," "The Vestiges of God in Creation," and "The Human Race bears Testimony to God." The fifth chapter, extending over fifty pages, is occupied with the subject of Buddhism, its history, leading ideas, and errors. We regard this chapter as one of the most timely, as well as one of the most satisfactory, in the whole work. Buddhism is a pretentious and subtle system, and some

of its most pernicious errors find congenial soil in the materialism and pessimism of our age.

The next six chapters are occupied respectively with the following subjects: "God in the Moral World," "The Nature of the Human Soul—Its Immortality," "Conscience as a Witness to God," "The Proofs of Conscience Confirmed," "The Knowledge of God Attainable by all Men," "St. Augustine's Soliloquy with God."

The work concludes with a valuable "Appendix," containing a refutation of Darwinism; an exposure of errors and fallacies in the article on "Theism" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica;" an account of the "Sacred Books of the East, and a Brief Treatise on the different Names of God."

The work, as we have said, is a timely one, and of permanent value. It will be especially of practical use to persons who are frequently brought into contact with infidels and skeptics; for it will furnish them with weapons ready for use to expose their errors and demolish their sophistical fallacies.

MISCELLANIES. By *Henry Edward*, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Vol. III. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1888.

This volume is truly *multum in parvo*. Cardinal Manning is well known to be a concise as well as a lucid writer, well able to place his subject in strong light before his readers, without circumlocution and with few words. It would be difficult to find, among all our current literature, a book more replete with important historical facts and pregnant thoughts logically arranged and clearly set forth, than is the volume before us. The subjects, too, which it treats are subjects which, without exception, are vitally connected with burning questions of our own times, or have a direct bearing upon them.

All the papers, too, which the volume comprises, are taken from the writings of Cardinal Manning during the last few years, the earliest of them dating back only to 1880. They may be taken, therefore, as embodying the ripest experience and reflection, of one who has closely studied men and things, and living facts as well as books, for upwards of fifty years of adult manhood, and who has been himself *magna pars* of many important movements of his times.

Some of the papers treat subjects of universal importance; others discuss questions which, at first thought, judging them merely by their title, apply only to the social, political, or religious condition of England. But the subjects of this last-mentioned character are examined and treated in such broad and comprehensive manner, and on the basis of principles which are of such universal application, that they will be read, not only with interest, but with great profit, by citizens of all countries.

A number of these papers discuss profoundly (not profoundly in the sense of resorting to technical methods, but profoundly as going to the central root of the matter), and practically, the burning subject of education. They treat it from different sides, and set forth, with axiomatic clearness and force, the ideas and principles which ought to rule and govern this whole important subject in its bearings upon the rights and duties of children, the rights and duties of parents, the relations of children and of parents to society and civil government and to the Church, and the rights, duties, authority, and power of the State, on the one hand, and of the Church, on the other, to children and to parents, as regards education.

Another class of papers in the volume sets forth, under various titles, such as "Atheism and the Constitution of England," "Without God,

No Commonwealth," "Parliamentary Oaths," etc., and with reference to different practical applications of the same general truth, the relation of religion to human society and civil government. Others of these papers deal with important practical social subjects, such as "Our National Vice" (a lucid and powerful exposition of the evils of intemperance); "Pleading for the Worthless" "Out-door Relief," "The Law of Nature, Divine and Supreme" (an article published in the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW* on the right of the starving to bread), etc. Still other papers are on subjects of a more strictly ecclesiastical character, discussed broadly and in their general relations to human society, such as "The Salvation Army," "The Catholic Church and Modern Society," "The Soul Before and After Death," "The Church its Own Witness," etc.

It is scarcely necessary for us to add, after this statement of the contents of the volume, that it will not only interest and instruct intelligent readers, but will also serve as a valuable hand-book to speakers who wish to quickly furnish themselves with facts and thoughts upon the many important subjects which it treats.

THE LIFE OF ST. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA. By *Father Genelli*, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the German by M. Charles Sainte Foi, and rendered from the French by the Rev. Thomas Meyrick, S. J. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

It is indeed by a roundabout way that this book has reached us. But perhaps it has gained rather than lost merit in its circuitous course, for it is made to appear in very good English and a simple style that is far more easily adopted from the French than the German. But the strictest fidelity to originals, even of idiom, is observed in one particular—Father Genelli, M. Sainte Foi and Father Meyrick, in quoting the writings of St. Ignatius, adhere, as much as possible, not only to the sense, but as well to the construction and the mannerism of the phrase. M. Sainte Foi thus gives the reason for this course: "I have chosen to sacrifice the beauty of a free translation to the preservation of the original, so that the reader in perusing it may recognize, not only the meaning of the author, but his very spirit and way of expressing it. . . . I have done it not only out of respect for the great Saint whose life I here give, but for the love of truth and for the advantage of those readers who like to find in the words of great men, and of Saints especially, the peculiar stamp which distinguishes their character."

There were so many lives of the founder of the Society of Jesus already in the hands of the public that it may well be asked why this one has been added to the list, and that too at a time when he and his Society are in great disfavor in many countries. But Father Genelli had more than one very praiseworthy object in view. He had "a taste for that method of historical pursuit which by close observation of facts throw clearer light upon the character of times and persons." He had "observed that the lives of St. Ignatius hitherto published have kept rather to the surface of things, without endeavoring to trace out their connection or to dive into the motives which actuated this great man, or into the world of thought which was awakened in his soul." He had wanted to refute "the unfounded supposition made by those who pretend that the Society of Jesus is not what it was when St. Ignatius founded it." For these and other reasons he undertook to write this new life, in which he lets the Saint paint his own character by means of his letters and other writings. Father Genelli has fully availed himself of the recent progress made in historical research, and has produced a work that throws much light, not only on the subject of the biography,

but also on the age in which he lived. This book deserves to take the place of a standard biography.

CATHOLIC WORSHIP. The Sacraments, Ceremonies and Festivals of the Church explained in Questions and Answers. By *Rev. O. Gisler*. Translated from the German by Rev. Richard Brennan, LL D. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

Besides the answers to the questions there are added almost on every page supplementary explanations that throw much additional light on the subjects discussed. Throughout the whole book the language is clear and simple. Everything about it goes to make this little volume eminently useful as a book of religious instruction in general, but more especially in the Sunday School, where every teacher should use it.

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW (Monthly). No. 1, January, 1889. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.

This is a periodical intended to discuss subjects relating to Theology, Canon law, and church discipline. It is edited by Reverend H. J. Heuser, of Philadelphia. Father Heuser is a Professor in the Theological Seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, and is well qualified for the important position to which he has been called.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE LIFE OF BLESSED MARTIN. De Porres (a negro Saint), of the Third Order of St. Dominic, in the Province of St. John Baptist, of Peru. Translated from the Italian by *Lady Herbert*. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

SERMONS AT MASS. By the *Rev. Patrick O'Keefe, C. C.*, author of "Moral Discourses." Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1888.

SELECTIONS FROM THE SERMONS OF PADRE AGOSTINO DA MONTEFALTO. Edited by *Catharine Mary Phillimore*. London: The Church Printing Company.

FROM THE WORLD TO THE CLOISTER; OR, MY NARRATIVE. By *Bernard*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1888.

LOURDES, ITS INHABITANTS, ITS PILGRIMS, AND ITS MIRACLES. With an Account of the Apparitions at the Grotto, and a Sketch of Bernadette's Subsequent History. By *Richard Clarke, S. J.* New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1888.

AROER, THE STORY OF A VOCATION. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

LIFE OF LADY GEORGINA FULLERTON. From the French of Mrs. Augustus Craven. By *Henry James Coleridge, S. J.* London: Richard Bentley & Son. 1888.

SIX SERMONS ON DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART. By *Rev. Ewald Bierbaum, D D.* Translated from the German by Miss Ella MacMahon. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1888.

RECORDS OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS OF 1715. Compiled wholly from Original Documents. Edited by *John Orlebar Payne, M.A.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF ARCHBISHOP ULLATHORNE, WITH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION. Arranged by the *Rev. Michael F. Glancey*, late of St. Mary's College, Oscott. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates, limited. 1889.

LEAVES FROM ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM. Selected and Translated by *Mary H. Allies*. Edited, with a Preface, by T. W. Allies, K. C. S. G. New York: Catholic Publication Society. London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

LETTERS TO PERSONS IN RELIGION. With Introduction by *Bishop Hedley*, and Fac-Simile of the Saint's Handwriting. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1888.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—APRIL, 1889.—No. 54.

MYTHS AND LEGENDS OF THE "REFORMATION."

HOW much light modern research has thrown on the Middle Ages is known to all students of history. They also know how strong has been the testimony borne by modern scholarship to the beneficent activity of the Popes and the Church in those often misjudged times. In the October number of the REVIEW we have given some of the most striking results of modern investigation on this period. The aim of the article referred to, however, was not only to throw light on the "Dark" Ages; it was broader and more comprehensive. Our aim was to prove to our readers, by an appeal to the facts, that the Church has nothing to fear, but much to hope, from historical science. Lest, however, the premises appear too narrow for this conclusion, we shall extend our researches, and study another great historical question, the question of the "Reformation."

Of course, we shall not enter into an examination of Luther's doctrines, of their truth or consistency. This is foreign to our purpose, and besides it is useless to slay the dead; Luther's most cardinal doctrine, that of justification by faith alone, was buried by his own disciples centuries ago, and not a few of his other doctrines have followed that to the grave. To-day the world is little interested in Luther the constructive theologian; but the history of Luther's movements has by no means lost its interest. No book, of late, has so exasperated and dismayed the German supporters of the "Reformation" as Janssen's "History of the German

VOL. XIV.—13

People." Still Janssen never enters into theological discussions, never attempts to analyze or refute Luther's teachings. Whence, therefore, the dismay of the "Reformer's" friends? Because Janssen mildly and mercilessly demolishes the traditional Luther; because historical truth compelled him to draw attention to some very inconvenient features in Luther's career. In the nineteenth century, in the days of the Rothschilds and the Bleichröders, it is inconvenient for his followers to be regaled with an authentic picture of the "Reformer's" brutal intolerance, not only of Catholics—that would not have stung the men of the *Cultur-Kampf*—but of Jews; in the days of the new German empire it is inconvenient to be reminded of the "Reformer's" repeated faithlessness to the old German empire; in the days of Deroulède and the French Patriotic League it is inconvenient to read of the "Reformer's" approval of the coquetting, nay, the alliance of his friends with Germany's arch-enemy. The "Reformation" meant tolerance, we have heard re-echoed in every key, major and minor. But the arch-"reformer's" own words prove him a brutal denouncer of Catholic, Calvinist, and Jew. Luther was the great German patriot, sang his admirers in loud chorus. Alas! that men's writing will live after them; for Luther had written himself down—well, we shall not use harsh words—a friend of Germany's hereditary foe. Strange, indeed, and unlikely does it appear that error and falsehood should entwine themselves around so public, so stupendous a series of events as that comprised in the word "Reformation." But history cannot be based on assumptions, and the new historical school takes nothing for granted. Already it has overhauled a great part of what passed for the history of the "Reformation." It has re-examined old witnesses, and brought new witnesses on the stand. It has put aside second-hand authorities, and gone to the sources. And though it is hard for human nature to lay aside long-cherished opinions, even non-Catholic followers of the new school have not wilfully closed their eyes to the light, nor sealed their lips, when truth brushed away the inherited error of ages. We shall review a few of their conclusions.

"At one time," says Prof. K. Pearson, "not only the German Protestants believed, but leading Protestant historians stated as a fact, that Luther had translated the Bible for the first time. Then when the existence of eighteen previous editions (printed German translations are meant) could no longer be disguised, it was broadly hinted that they never reached the people, that they were based only on the Vulgate, that the language is awkward, heavy, and neither precise in sense nor happy in expression.¹ So Goedeke.

¹ Prof. Pearson here gives the German text: "Die Sprache ist unbeholfen schwerfällig und weder genau im Sinn noch treffend im Ausdruck."

This was met by the proof that their language was a perfect mine of folk-expression, homely and true; nay, further, it was shown that Luther, so far from translating from the original Greek, had in the New Testament, to a great extent, only modernized the old German Vulgate. The September Bible was only a natural growth out of the version of the *Codex Teplensis* of the fourteenth century."¹ "Where Luther does differ from the (pre-'Reformation') German Vulgate is very often in those passages in which his own strong sense of the righteousness of his own dogma has led him to pervert the text. Against Emser's 2400 'heretical errors, lies, and wrong tense-renderings,' I may cite Bunsen's 3000 inaccuracies. . . . Mr. Hutchinson tells us that Luther probably began Greek in 1512. We happen to know that he began it in August, 1518. Let me cite what was written two years ago, and remind the reader that to *revise*, not translate, cost our thorough Greek scholars ten years' work, 1870-1880. On the 25th of August, 1518, Melanchthon arrived in Wittenberg; then, for the first time, Luther, attending the lectures of Melanchthon, began to study Greek. This is shown not only by Luther's letters, but Melanchthon in a speech to the students, recommending the study of Greek, points out to them Luther's example in Luther himself, who, already advanced in years (*quamvis jam senex*), has learned the Greek tongue. In June, 1519, we have the famous Leipzig disputation with Eck, and in April, 1521, Luther arrives in Worms; he is in bitter and prolonged controversy with Eck and Emser, he is writing book after book against the Pope and his bull, and he is contesting the condemnation of the leading universities of Christendom. In 1520 alone he publishes three epoch-making works, and yet he must find time to study Greek. On December 21st, 1521, Luther wrote to Lange of his determination to translate the New Testament, and within a less period than three months the work is completed. Returning on March 1st from the Wartburg to Wittenberg, he managed to review the translation with Melanchthon notwithstanding the Carlstadt difficulties, and on the 21st of September the New Testament is issued completed from the press. To translate, revise, and print occupied less than nine months, and this notwithstanding Luther's three most broken years of Greek study. Does not such external evidence fully confirm internal coincidences and point to Luther's dependence on his predecessors?"²

"Luther," says Paulsen, "appreciated the old (classical) writers, especially the Roman, which were almost the only classics he knew."³ "The Greek authors," says O. Schmidt, in a pamphlet

¹ K. Pearson in *Academy* of September 26th, 1885.

² K. Pearson in *Academy* of October 10th, 1885, pp. 240-1.

³ Paulsen, *l. c.*, p. 147.

on "Luther's acquaintance with the Classics," "were little known to him."

The fact that in Germany at least fourteen high-German and four low-German translations of the Bible had been printed before the "Reformation" could no longer be denied. It was a bitter dose for the old-fashioned worshippers of Luther. Must they concede that their prophet was wrong? that he had slandered the Catholic Church? that the Church had not withheld from her children the saving nourishment of the Bible? It was too much to expect such an admission at once. They set their wits to work, and lo! they thought they had found a way to escape the disagreeable inference. The eighteen editions were printed—that could not be denied; the books were in evidence. But were they printed by Catholics and for Catholics? Was the translation a Catholic translation? For whom, suggested common sense, if not for Catholics should they be printed? Was not Germany, as a whole, Catholic before Luther? The censorship of books existed in the electorate of Mainz since 1486, and Archbishop Berthold, of Mainz, bid the censors withhold their approval from books "if perchance they cannot be correctly translated, if they rather beget scandal and error, or offend modesty." Nevertheless, twelve out of the eighteen German Bible translations were printed in the province of Mainz. Were the censors asleep? or how could fourteen editions of a heretical Bible be published there, and for heretics, too?

Serious difficulties these. Still they did not appal the zealous defenders of Luther. In 1885 a Protestant clergyman, Keller by name, published a work on "The Reformation and the Older Reform Parties." He had made a discovery. "The opinion heretofore prevailing, that the German Bible translation sprang from orthodox Roman Catholic sources, is wholly false; the German people owes it to the Bible-believing heretics, the Waldensians." Protestant critics, even such as otherwise condemned the book without mercy, admitted this conclusion. Keller's arguments, however, were by no means convincing. So, in the same year, Dr. H. Haupt published a new work to correct and complete the reasoning. But, alas! for the futility of human endeavors! Scarcely had Haupt placed his book before the public when forthwith comes forward another non-Catholic, Dr. Franz Jostes,¹ and topples over the beautifully constructed house of cards. Keller's and Haupt's arguments, external and internal, are tested and found to

¹ Quoted by Paulsen on the same page.

² Dr. F. Jostes, *Die Waldenser und die vorlutherische deutsche Bibelübersetzung*. Münster, 1885.

be based on imagination and ignorance. "The writer" (Jostes), says Prof. Pearson, "subjects the Keller-Haupt hypothesis to a fairly searching criticism, which will do much to assuage that sectarian enthusiasm which has swept through the Protestant press of Germany. . . . We shall note with some curiosity whether the remarkable interest, recently manifested by Lutheran theologians for the pre-Lutheran Vulgate, will now begin to subside."

So much for the German pre-Lutheran Bible translations. But what of Haupt's assertion that the Church had forbidden wholly the use of Bible translations? It is true that in certain places and for good reasons certain translations were forbidden in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. But "in Spain only were Spanish translations generally prohibited by *royal* edict since the end of the thirteenth century." "In Germany, the only prohibition (which was no prohibition at all) is contained in a decree of Berthold, Archbishop of Mainz, establishing a preventive censorship." "By the Council of Trent, and not before, the use of German Bibles by laymen was greatly restricted, though not wholly forbidden. But the proscription was by many not regarded as binding. The Bavarian catalogue of forbidden books for 1566, for example, mentions among the most useful books for laymen the Bibles of Eck and Dietenberger, the New Testament of Emser, and the very old translation of the Bible or of some extracts therefrom. . . . which, however, are not often printed now. As late as 1612 the Jesuit Serarius says: "If anyone in Germany reads without special permission the Bible of Eck or Dietenberger, this is not only not censured or punished by bishops, pastors, and confessors, but rather approved and praised, as if a general permission had been given."

How bitterly opposed Catholic priests were to the reading of the Bible in the fifteenth century may be inferred from a fact recorded at Leyden, in the Netherlands, at that time a part of the German Emperor's possessions. "There, in the year 1462, Willem Heerman, a respected burgher, presented to the city a copy of the complete German Bible, prepared by his own hand. This copy was placed in St. Peter's Church for the use of 'all good honest men, who wish to read therein and study something good.' During the Middle Ages the churches were always open throughout the day." "Regarding the spread of our old Bible translation," says W. Moll, Professor of Protestant Theology at Amsterdam, "we can report but little. As far as the lay world is concerned it was

¹ Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, vol. i., p. 43, quoted in Jostes, *Die Waldenser*, p. 21. Reusch is an Old Catholic.

² Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 22.

³ Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 231.

⁴ Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 281.

probably most often used in women's convents, in Beguin houses, and in assemblies of Sisters of the Common Life, and moreover in men's convents, which, besides monks, also included uneducated lay brothers. That since the middle of the fifteenth century it existed in many, if not in all, convents, either complete or in extracts, is likely in view of the copies which exist in our public and private libraries, which are numerous, and generally bear the proofs of coming from convents."¹ The history of the French Bible during the Middle Ages has recently been traced by M. Samuel Berger in his work, *La Bible Française au Moyen Age*. He found a French version of the books of Samuel and the Kings dating back as early as 1150 A.D. In the thirteenth century the whole Bible was translated, some books being accompanied with a commentary. "About 1300 A.D., Desmoulins, Canon of Aire in Anjou, wrote in the Picard dialect his '*Bible Historiale*,' made up of the text of the Bible with some omissions and a free translation of the *Historia Scholastica* of Petrus Comestor. . . . The first volume of Desmoulins, and the second volume of the Century Bible, make up the received French Bibles of the Middle Ages, which spread in countless copies over Europe, from England to Italy."² Here, too, as recently in Germany, the Waldenses were called in to account for the numerous French Bibles. "During this period" (eleventh century to St. Louis), says Mr. Wicksteed in the same article, "falls that attack on the Bible readers of Metz under Innocent III., round which a romantic legend has grown up, tempting uncritical critics to identify every version of the Bible with the supposed work of Pierre Valdus, '*La Bible des Vaudois*.' M. Berger shows, with admirable diligence, that no such work ever existed. . . . So ends '*la Legende de la Bible des Vaudois*.'"³ In England the venerable Bede translated parts of the Scriptures as early as the eighth century, and the Psalms were translated by King Alfred. After the Norman Conquest, besides partial translations, we know of a complete one dated 1290, and in the fourteenth century the new version of John of Treviso was made. Such of our readers as desire to know more of the vernacular versions of the Bible we refer to Spalding's *History of the Reformation* (vol. i., p. 292). One more fact may be cited to show how false it is that the Church forbade the reading of the Bible. "How great a number of readers," says the Protestant Geffcken, "is presupposed by ninety-eight editions of the whole Latin Bible, which are catalogued by Hain up to A.D. 1500 as numbers 3031-3128." In the fifty years immediately succeeding the

¹ Moll, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland vor de Hervorming*, ii., 334, quoted in Jostes, *l. c.*, p. 24.

² P. H. Wicksteed in *Academy*, No. 647.

³ Wicksteed in the same article.

invention of printing, so extensive a work as the Latin Bible—the complete Latin Bible—is published ninety-eight times, besides eighteen German translations, and men will still believe Luther's assertion, that "the Biblia were unknown to people under popery." "In the fifteenth century," says Prof. Pearson, "it (the Catholic Church) certainly did not hold back the Bible from the folk. And it gave them in the vernacular a long series of devotional works, which for language and religious sentiment have never been surpassed. Indeed, we are inclined to think it made a mistake in allowing the masses such ready access to the Bible. It ought to have recognized the Bible once and for all as a work absolutely unintelligible without a long course of historical study, and so long as it was supposed to be inspired, very dangerous in the hands of the ignorant."¹

The immorality of the ancient clergy has always been a favorite theme with the "Reformers" and their admirers. This immorality, we are told again and again, was undoubtedly one of the chief causes of the "Reformation." Let us hear, however, one of the best informed authorities on the condition of England in Henry VIII.'s time, the late Prof. Brewer. "Nor considering the temper of the English people, is it probable that immorality could have existed among the ancient clergy to the degree which the exaggeration of poets, preachers, and satirists might lead us to suppose. The existence of such corruption is not justified by authentic documents, or by an impartial and broad estimate of the character and conduct of the nation before the Reformation. There is nothing more difficult than for contemporaries to form, from their own limited experience, a just estimate of the morality of the times in which they live; and if the complaints of preachers and moralists are to be accepted as authoritative on this head, there would be no difficulty in producing abundant evidence from the Reformers themselves that the abuses and enormities of their own age under Edward VI. and Elizabeth were far greater than in the ages preceding."²

Later researches strongly support Prof. Brewer's views. The results of these researches are laid down chiefly in the Benedictine Dom Gasquet's work on "Henry VIII. and the Suppression of the English Monasteries," and in the tenth volume of the "Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.," edited by James Gairdner. That sensitively moral monarch, bluff King Harry, appointed a commission to visit the monasteries, and it is chiefly on the strength of its report that the grossest vices have been imputed to

¹ Prof. Pearson in *Academy*, August 7th, 1886, p. 85.

² Brewer, "The Reign of Henry VIII.," vol. ii., p. 469.

the English monks of Henry's time by historian after historian. What is the verdict of scientific history on these charges? There is no more fair and competent authority on this period of English history and on this question than the Protestant editor of the records of the reign of Henry VIII., James Gairdner. Here is his opinion as laid down in a criticism of Dom Gasquet's work in the *Academy* of February 25th, 1888, p. 125. "A mysterious Black Book is supposed to have been compiled when the monasteries were visited in the reign of Henry VIII.; and such extraordinary revelations were then made of the dissolute lives of monks and nuns, that an indignant Parliament insisted on the suppression of these dens of vice. That the Black Book had disappeared with all its damning evidence, was a fact which occasioned no difficulty to a writer like Burnet, who found that in the reign of Queen Mary a commission was granted to Bonner and others to examine the records of "divers infamous scrutinies in religious houses." The commission itself, indeed, said nothing about the destruction of these records when found; but rather that they should be 'brought to knowledge.' Still it was clear to the Protestant mind (at least in the days of Bp. Burnet) that the only object of inquiring after such things could be to destroy the evidences of things casting such deep discredit on the papal system. Well, whatever may have become of the 'Black Book' itself, it is clear that the destruction of evidence could not have gone very far; for at least three or four documents still exist (and were referred to by Burton in his "Anatomy of Melancholy" long before Burnet wrote), giving a black enough account of the state of the monasteries in Henry VIII.'s time just before their suppression. These three or four separate documents were possibly intended to form parts of a comprehensive book reporting on monasteries throughout England; but altogether they embrace only certain districts, and it is clear only a minority of the houses are reported on even in these. These reports contain accusations of the foulest character—often of unmentionable crimes—against several of the inmates, in a considerable number of the houses. But they are accusations merely, unaccompanied by a particle of evidence to support them; and we know quite well now-a-days by whom and under what circumstances they were drawn up. They are in the hand-writing of John ap Rice, a notary who accompanied Cromwell's visitor, Dr. Legh, in the work of inspecting the monasteries; and we can distinctly trace in the correspondence of Dr. Legh himself and his fellow visitor, Dr. Layton, the dates at which each of these separate reports was transmitted to their master. . . . It appears that the whole work was done with such amazing rapidity that it is simply out of the question to suppose that anything like the

enormities reported were proved by anything like a judicial inquiry.

. . . . That the case against the monasteries was prejudiced, appears clearly from some of the letters of the visitors themselves. When Layton, in a fit of comparative honesty, had spoken well of the monastery of Glastonbury, he was admonished that his report did not give satisfaction; so he wrote immediately to apologize for his 'indiscreet praise,' acknowledging that the Abbott appeared 'neither to have known God, nor his prince, nor any part of a good Christian man's religion!' And to avoid a similar mistake at St. Mary's, York, he writes that he 'supposes to find evil disposition both in the Abbott and convent, whereof, God willing, I shall certify you in my next letters.' It is needless to say that the testimony of such an accuser is absolutely worthless. And as for his fellow, Dr. Legh—even his associate Ap Rice felt compelled to write to Cromwell of his tyranny and extortion, begging him at the same time not to disclose that he had done so, else his life would hardly be safe from the bullies and serving men in Legh's employment.

"Finally the accusations, when they had served their purpose, were discredited even by a royal commission issued immediately afterwards to report upon the condition of the monasteries with a view to their suppression. . . . Strange to say, the returns of this commission, so far as they have been collected hitherto, give the monks in almost all the houses a high character for probity, zeal, hospitality, and sometimes (we may add) for particular kinds of industry, such as writing, embroidery, or painting. Nor is this all; for it stands no less clearly recorded that several of these monasteries which look worst in the reports of the visitors, stood highest in the esteem of the neighbors—the country gentlemen who had the duty imposed upon them of making these returns. The huge mass of scandal compiled by Drs. Legh and Layton was clearly believed by no one, not even by the King or Cromwell, or, we may add, by the visitors themselves." "Something much worse than the grossest exaggerations," says the *Athenæum* (Feb. 18th, 1888), "something much more like impudent and enormous lying—is the rule and not the exception in the returns of the King's first inquisitors. . . . Perhaps the strongest impression that this (tenth) volume of the Calendars produces upon the reader is not that the history of Henry VIII. will have to be re-written, but that it has never been written at all."

So much on the corruption of the clergy in England. In Germany similar charges were first made against the clergy, and above all against the university men in the famous "*Epistola Obscurorum Virorum*." These "obscure men," to wit, Ulrich von Hutten, Mutianus and his friends of the Erfurt University, where

Luther formed one of the circle, poured forth the most unmeasured abuse against the morals, the ignorance, and the shabby ragged dress of the university clergy. "Was this a true picture of the university men?" asks Prof. Paulsen. "As regards their hatred of poetry, of pure Latin, of the Greek language, in short of humanism, the account which follows will prove that the universities did not all deserve this reproach. As regards profligacy and disgraceful neglect of dress, no one will be surprised that then, as at all times, they were met with at the universities. About one circle of university men we are specially well informed on this point, the circle to which the authors of this satire belonged. What Mutianus, otherwise a respectable man, thought of sexual relations, we may read in the letters, hitherto unpublished, given by Janssen and Krause, in which he advises his young friends to help themselves. That Hutten needed no adviser on this point is well enough known. On the ragged appearance, poverty, and beggary of the same men (the dark men) the same works give us manifold, but by no means pleasant, information. It is strange that Strauss (the author of the "Life of Christ") could represent as the champion of human liberty and German culture the Franconian Knight (Von Hutten), who, wasting of a wretched disease, always penniless, but full of magnificent pretensions, roamed from place to place and stimulated the generosity of lords, spiritual and temporal, with Latin verses. But he assailed Rome. I think better weapons and better men were needed, and are still needed every day in the struggle for German liberty and culture."¹ How much faith the unblushing effrontery of Hutten and his friends deserves, it takes no Solomon to determine. On many other points of their indictment, Paulsen has convicted the "dark men" of exaggeration, falsehood, and slander. Is it rash to infer that they exaggerated on this point also? True, the leading "Reformers," many of whom were by no means vestal virgins, were mostly run-away monks and apostate priests; true, likewise, that the German clergy of the time, whose bishops were princes first, and, in not a few instances, princes first, last, and all the time—men who too often did not watch over their flocks and their pastors—were far less worthy men than the German clergy of to-day. On the other hand, we should not forget that opportunity makes thieves. Many of these men, in other more peaceful days, with no Luther and Carlstadt issuing trumpet call after trumpet call to monks and nuns, summoning them to cast aside their promises and break their vows, might have lived in honest obscurity, instead of becoming firebrands of scandal and preachers

¹ Paulsen, *l. c.*, p. 51.

of sedition. On the whole, then, whilst admitting many abuses, it is safe not to place implicit trust in the unblushing accusers of the Von Hutten type, and to make great allowance even when we read the invectives of honest satirists and zealous preachers.

Protestant historians of the past have generally represented the "Reformation" as a movement that swept over England and Germany like a whirlwind; the word "whirlwind" hardly did justice to the rapidity of the movement. It leaped from end to end of Germany like an electric flash. Reading these writers, you fancied the whole German and English peoples, standing like hungry birdlings, anxious to be fed with the pap of the new and pure "gospel." It was a heart-moving picture: it was more, it was an appeal to the jury on the *vox populi vox Dei* principle. In these days of universal suffrage, who could doubt that the "Reformers" were right, when they had the majority? But unluckily the muse of history cannot be won with sentimental imagery. She brushes the pictures away like cobwebs and probes the facts. And what are the facts? "The Reformation" (in England), says Prof. Brewer, "did not owe its origin to Tyndale or to Parliament, to the corruptions of the clergy or the oppression of the ecclesiastical courts. There is no reason to believe that the nation as a body was discontented with the old religion. Facts point to the opposite conclusion. Had it been so, Mary, whose attachment to the faith of her mother was well known, would never have been permitted to mount the throne or have found the task comparatively easy, seeing that the Reformers under Edward VI. had been suffered to have their own way unchecked and to displace from power and influence all who opposed their religious principles. Long down into the reign of Elizabeth, according to the testimony of a modern historian, the old faith still numbered a majority of adherents in England. The experiment would have been hazardous at any time from Henry VIII. to the Spanish invasion if a plebiscite could have been impartially taken of the religious sentiments of the people. This rooted attachment to the old faith and the difficulty everywhere experienced by the Government and the bishops in weaning the clergy and their flocks from their ancient tendencies, is a sufficient proof that it was not unpopular."¹

"I think," says Bishop Stubbs, "that after what I have said, you will allow me to say that I have grounds for believing that Henry VIII. was the master, and in no sense the minister, of his people; that where he carried their good (?) will with him, it was by forcing, not by anticipating or even educating it. I am obliged altogether to reject the notion that he was the interpreter in any

¹ Brewer, "The Reign of Henry VIII.," vol. ii., p. 469.

sense of the wishes of his people; the utmost that he did in this direction was to manipulate and utilize their prejudices to his own purposes."¹ At the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, after Henry VIII. had used both force and money to wean his nobles and people from their allegiance to Rome, after the Protector Somerset and the other statesmen of Edward VI. had striven by hook or crook to make England Protestant, after Mary's short and in many respects unfortunate reign, "in number the laity, who preferred the mass to the prayer-book, and perhaps the Pope to the Queen as a spiritual head, have been reckoned at nearly two-thirds of the whole population."²

In Germany, the birth-place of the "Reformation," Luther's innovations were by no means received by the people with universal acclaim. Luther himself was fully aware of this. He did not abolish the Mass at once: not even in the electorate of Saxony, where he was permitted by the Elector to wield almost unbounded power in religious affairs. He bade the preachers omit the words in the Canon and Collect that implied a sacrifice. "But the priest may omit this readily, without its being noticed by the common people, and without giving scandal."³ So Luther in 1526. "During a visitation held in the districts of Borma and Tenneberg in January, 1526, by order of the Elector of Saxony, it became apparent how Lutheranism, at that time, had made far from general progress. In Tenneberg, which included twelve parishes, not a single clergyman preached 'the Gospel,' *i.e.*, Luther's doctrine. Only an odd parish desired a change in the sense of the Reformers."⁴ In 1528 Melanchthon made an official visitation of Thüringen. He found the people attached neither to the new doctrine nor to its preachers. "We see," he wrote in 1528, "how the people hate us."⁵ In 1530 things had not improved. Luther's father lay critically ill at Mansfeld; the son was anxious, consoled his father, but dared not visit him, fearing the people might kill him. "I am exceedingly anxious," he wrote to his father, "to come to see you in person; but my good friends have advised against it and dissuaded me, and I, myself, was forced to think that I must not risk danger and tempt God, for you know how lords and peasants love me." The people were still so devoted to the old Church that Luther maintained: "Were I willing, I am easily

¹ W. Stubbs, "On the Study of Mediæval and Modern History," p. 289.

² T. G. Laws in the *English Historical Review*, vol. i., p. 514.

³ Luther, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 28, p. 304-5, quoted by Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, iii., p. 62.

⁴ Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 56.

⁵ Janssen, *l. c.*, p. 64.

confident that I could, by two or three sermons, preach back my people into popery and establish new pilgrimages and masses." "I know for certain that here in Wittenberg there are hardly ten that I could not mislead, were I willing to practise again such holiness as I practised in popery, when I was a monk."¹ Even in 1535 Luther and "the Saxon theologians would not concede the demand of the Zwinglian preachers to do away with the Elevation, the Mass vestments and the altar candles, because they feared thereby to call forth excitement among the people."² About the religious feeling in Brunswick two official Lutheran visitors wrote to Bugenhagen in 1543: "In all churches and country parishes, though lying near each other, each one wishes to teach and administer the sacrament after his own head and fashion. Many parsons complain that the people will not go to the Lord's supper, nay condemn sermons and sacraments, and say publicly: the parsons are not at one about the Gospel, why should we heed them? I will hold to my old faith."³ "The greatest part of the people," said Court-preacher Hieronymus Rauscher of Amberg in 1552, "in deep sorrow, turns its eyes to Godless popery, foams and gabbles at all times: 'Since the new doctrine began its course, there has been no luck and happiness in the world: people grow worse, not better, in consequence of evangelical preaching.' Even a generation later Preacher George Steinhart, at Ottersdorf, heard people say: "Ah! Away with this doctrine! Under the Pope's rule things went well, those were good times, and we had all things in plenty; but since the Gospel sprang up, leaves and grass, luck, rain, and blessings have disappeared."⁴ In the Netherlands things looked very ill for the "Godly" undertaking of the house of Nassau; every effort was made to Calvinize the Provinces, but met with little success. "Of the general states and the noblest of the land," wrote Count John (of Nassau), on March 13th, 1578, to Count William of Hesse. "no one has hitherto publicly declared for 'religion,' nor seriously worked for it; of the people only now and then the poor common man."⁵

In England, Germany, Holland, we see, there was no violent hunger after the "new gospel," and yet these three countries were the birthplace, the home and the hot-bed of the "Reformers," "Where Protestantism was an idea only," says Bishop Stubbs, "as in Spain and Italy, it was crushed out by the Inquisition; where, in conjunction with political power and sustained by ecclesiastical

¹ Quoted in Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 188.

² Janssen, *l. c.* iii., pp. 494-5.

³ Janssen, *l. c.* v., p. 5.

⁴ Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 355.

⁵ Janssen, *l. c.* iii., p. 702.

confiscation, it became a physical force, there it was lasting. It is not a pleasant view to take of the doctrinal changes, to see that where the movement toward it was pure and unworldly, it failed; where it was seconded by territorial greed and political animosity, it succeeded."¹

How unfounded was Luther's assertion that before his day little preaching was done, we have shown in the article on the "Myths of the Middle Ages," published in the October number of the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY*, last year (p. 604). The lack of preaching could not have caused the "Reformation" and its spread. Indeed, it is far from true that, even at the beginning of the "Reformation" there was everywhere more preaching of the new faith than there had been of the old. In Germany and Holland, no doubt, there was no lack of preachers damning the Pope and the Papists up and down, and the Protestant dissidents down and up; if damning up and down was preaching the new faith, the new faith was abundantly preached. In England, however, "what contrasts strangely with the reforming movement in Germany," says the *Saturday Review*, "so far from any pains being taken to present the new doctrine to the people, the pulpit stood silent, *partly by order*, as well as from lack of preachers. The Council ordered the bishops to prevent a thing so inconsistent as the preaching of itinerant ministers, and even the licensed preachers, of whom there were very few, were forbidden to discourse except on certain fixed days. Bucer complained that there were parishes where no sermon had been preached for years. Whether from distrust of the clergy, or from a desire to keep the mass of the people in ignorance of the real nature of the religious innovations being forced upon them with a high hand till all was over, preaching was in every way discountenanced or suppressed, so that in truth the great destitution of preaching, *which the Reformation produced*, was the main cause of the beginning of English Dissent."²

"But, perhaps," says the same writer, "what will most startle those who have been used to take a rose-colored view, we do not say of the 'Reformation'—that largely depends upon religious convictions—but of the English 'Reformers,' is the evidence here produced of the unscrupulous tyranny and obscurantism of their whole method of procedure. . . . What is curious, and will to many readers be a surprise, is that every means was taken by those in authority, as though of deliberate intent, to discourage learning

¹ Bp. Stubbs, "Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History," p. 233.

² *Saturday Review*, July 3d, 1886, p. 22, in an article on Rev. R. W. Dixon's "History of the Church of England."

and foster ignorance, alike in the higher classes and among the masses of the people. Thus, to begin with the two universities, a royal commission visited them in 1549, which, under pretence of reforming, went far to destroy them altogether, and Oxford and Cambridge seemed in danger of actually sharing the fate of the monasteries. Ridley, whose name stood on both commissions, attempted some ineffectual resistance, but was easily overborne. . . . Dr. Cox, Chancellor of Oxford, who was on the commission, won with too good reason the unenviable nickname of Cancellor of the University! Under his auspices whole libraries at Oxford were destroyed; 'a cart load of manuscript on theology and the sciences,' from Merton, and 'great heaps of books from Balliol, Queen's, Exeter, and Lincoln' were publicly burnt in the market-place. Meanwhile the choristers and grammar-school boys of the different College schools at both universities were turned out and the schools themselves suppressed."

In Germany, we know of no equally wanton destruction of books and schools. Still the effects of the "Reformation" movement were equally fatal to learning and education. As early as 1526, the Saxon visitors report the almost universal destruction of the parish schools in electoral Saxony.¹ The younger humanists had hailed Luther as a saviour and welcomed his revolt. "Before long," says Paulsen, "the young humanists, who just then so gaily accompanied Luther to the war, and considered Erasmus as a timid old man, were disappointed. As early as 1524 even the dullest had their eyes opened. The universities and schools almost came to nothing amidst the tempests of the religious struggle." It is instructive to look at a few details. "The university of Erfurt was the only one of the German universities which adopted the new doctrine; it was also the first that was undone by it. . . . After 1523 immatriculation stopped altogether; the university almost ceased to exist. . . . In 1524 the Erfurt town-council cut down the salary of the rector of the university, Eobanus Hessus, and in 1526 he went to Nuremberg. He returned in 1533, but the university never regained its strength; after wasting for 300 years it died." At the beginning Melanchthon's Greek lectures at Wittenberg were crowded; in 1524 four attended his lectures on Demosthenes; in 1527 the attendance was less; in that year, however, the plague drove Melanchthon to Jena. Leipzig suffered greatly; Frankfort on the Oder died out entirely between 1520-30, partly because of the religious troubles, partly in consequence of the plague. At Rostock the number of students sank rapidly after 1523; in 1529 not a single matriculation; from 1530-36 the university was practically dead. In a report of 1530 the council of the university

¹ Janssen, *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, iii., p. 63.

pronounced the Martinian, *i.e.*, Lutheran faction to be the cause. At Greifswald no matriculants between 1525 and 1539. At Cologne the number of matriculations fell from 3-400 to between 36 and 96 in 1527-43. About 1515 Vienna matriculated 600 per year; in 1530 the whole number of students was 30. The university records, as early as 1522, claim that the cause of the decline is that the Lutheran sect advises against studies and the taking of degrees. At Heidelberg there were more professors than students, whilst at Basel the university was suspended in 1529. In both universities the "Reformation" was charged with their ruin. Ingolstadt, which under the leadership of Eck destroyed every trace of the *virus Lutheranism*, fared best. The average of the matriculations from 1518-1550 was 136, only 36 less than in the period immediately preceding.¹ "The same decline appeared in the lower schools."²

Dr. Dixon's as well as Paulsen's statements are based on the most careful original research. They show not only what the religious revolution of the sixteenth century did to destroy, but what the Church of the Middle Ages had done to build up, learning. All the universities mentioned, besides others in Italy, France, Poland, had been founded by Catholic princes or cities, and none without the co-operation of the Pope.

That Luther, so to say, rediscovered the Bible, that he first translated it into German, that before him little preaching was done in the vernacular, that the "Reformation" was a popular movement, that it promoted learning and literature,—all these well-worn assertions modern research has pronounced to be myths. There remain a few claims and statements which, while they do not, like the foregoing, assail the Church, are nevertheless interesting. They illustrate Lutheran hero-worship, and show how dangerous it is to accept without careful critical examination many points of Protestant tradition, no matter how often and how confidently repeated. They are legends that grew up not all in Luther's day, but many of them much later, perhaps as late as after the Thirty Years' War. Indeed, in some cases, Luther's own writings refute the claims made for him by his admirers. The first of these legends is the story that Luther closed his speech before the Diet of Worms in 1521 with the memorable words: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise." Again and again they have called forth the admiration of Protestant writers; again and again they have been praised as the expression of the Reformer's manly and earnest determination. Like the famous *e pur si muove* of Galileo, however, Luther's heroic expression turns out to be unhistorical. This was

¹ These details are taken from Paulsen, *Gesch. des gelehrten Unterrichts*, p. 138 ff.

² Paulsen, *l. c.*, p. 143.

proved by Burkhardt, a Protestant, in the "Theologische Studien und Kritiken" (1869, p. 517-31).¹ Burkhardt's proposition is confirmed by Balan, who, in his *Monumenta Reformationis Lutheranae*, gives the contemporary report of Luther's speech. It does not contain the famous traditional words.

That Luther invented the new high-German language, is a legend which has been repeated even quite recently over the names of such men as Von Treitschke, Mommsen, Droysen, and Virchow. Luther himself says quite the reverse, and his words are confirmed by the best authorities on the history of the German language, such as the brothers Wilhelm and Jakob Grimm. "In reply to the question, whence Luther took this language" (the German of his Bible and other writings), says Osthoff, "he himself informs us that 'he uses no particular or peculiar language in German,' *i.e.*, no special dialect, but 'the language of the Saxon Chancery,' which is used by all the kings and princes of Germany."² Latin ceased to be used for documentary purposes in the first half of the fourteenth century. For some time thereafter the dialect of each principality was used in its official papers. Under Karl IV. and Wenzel (1347-1400), of the Luxemburg-Bohemian line, the Imperial Chancery used a language based on the German spoken at Prague, but modified; this was gradually adopted in upper and central Germany. In the second half of the fifteenth century the Saxon Chancery gradually discarded the words peculiar to central Germany, and used only such as were common to central and upper Germany. The accession of Frederick the Wise (1485), according to the latest researches, marks the time when the approximation of the language used by the Saxon Chancery to that used by the Imperial Chancery was carried out. "The language, therefore, which Luther introduced into general literary and private use as that of the Saxon Chancery, did not differ from the language of the documents spread by Maximilian I. and his secretaries throughout the Empire. . . . Luther did not create the unity of German speech as if by a single stroke. Only the first firm and lasting foundation thereof was laid by him and the Reformation. For a long time after in low-German countries, low-German was spoken in pulpit, school, and court. The Bible, catechism, and hymn-book were even translated from Luther's text into the several dialects. On Catholic Germany, the larger half of the Empire, the effect of Luther's language as well as of the Reformation itself was slight. And Luther's language, in spite of its universalizing tendency, was still too provincial, nay too individually colored, to be fitted to be

¹ Cited in *Geschichtslügen*, p. 432.

² Osthoff, *Schriftsprache und Volksmundart*, p. 4.

a universal means of communication, to become the natural German written and book language, without further changes."¹

Another flower which Luther's admirers have striven to weave into the legendary chaplet of his fame, is that he was the father of German congregational singing. But one by one the petals have fallen from the flower, and to-day it is uncertain whether more than five or six hymns, and whether a single one of the melodies formerly ascribed to him, can justly and fully be called his. Luther was fond of singing and music, but he himself never claimed to have written and composed all the hymns published in his hymn-book. In the preface to the edition of 1535, he says: "Now follow some sacred songs made by our forefathers (*von den alten gemacht*). These old songs we have taken with us as a testimony of some pious Christians that lived before our time in the great darkness of false doctrine, that it may be seen how there have always been people who rightly knew Christ and by God's grace were miraculously preserved in this knowledge." In the preface to his book of "Christian song, Latin and German, for burial," published in 1542, Luther says: "We have also taken as a good example the fine *musica*, or songs, which were used in popery at vigils, requiems, and burials, had some printed in this book, and in time will take more of them. The song and the notes are beautiful; it were pity, should they perish. As in all other points they (the Catholics) far excel us, have the finest divine service, fine, glorious convents and monasteries. . . . so, too, they have in truth much splendid music or song, especially in the monasteries and parishes." Notwithstanding Luther's own clear words, it became a legend among German Protestants that he first introduced German hymns in the divine service. Many Protestants believe in this legend to the present day; not a few writers continue to repeat it even now. Still, as early as 1784, General Superintendent Bernhart, of Stuttgart, saw the folly of this claim. "How could so busy a man," he says, "have taken up the writing of songs, composition, and notes? A man who held an office at the university, published numerous writings, and was overwhelmed with questions, letters and opinions from all quarters. Luther in his first hymn-book (1524) made only the first hymn, which bears his name. The rest were composed by Sperato and some unknown writers." Schauer, also a Protestant, reduced the number of original hymn-texts written by Luther to six. The others are paraphrases of the Psalms, modifications of old German hymns, and translations from the Latin of such hymns as the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, the *Te Deum*, etc. Even the most famous of all, "*Eine veste Burg ist unser*

¹ Osthoff, *Schriftsprache und Volksmundart*, pp. 4-7.

Gott," "A tower of strength our God doth stand," is only a paraphrase of the 46th Psalm.

As a hymn composer, Luther has fared even worse than as a text writer. In the eighteenth century he was regarded as the writer of all the hymn-book melodies; historical investigation gradually despoiled him of air after air, until only three melodies were left to his credit. But now W. Bäumker has shown that there is good reason to doubt his authorship of even these three, and Bäumker is endorsed by some of the best musical authorities in Germany. We shall content ourselves with citing the opinion of the non-Catholic editor of the *Allgemeine Deutsche Musik-Zeitung*, Herr Otto Lessmann: "In addition to Luther's other great qualities, tradition has attributed to him great creative power in music; but after the results of the latest Luther researches, the old legend of Luther's importance as a composer may be referred to the realm of inventions. Positive proof of Luther's authorship of a single choral melody does not exist. Even the most important of the hymns ascribed to Luther, that song so full of strength and splendor, '*Eine feste Burg*' ('A tower of strength our God doth stand'), which is said to have been written and composed by Luther at Coburg, in 1530, can hardly be regarded as his intellectual property—as far as the music goes, if we believe a manuscript note of the Reformer on one of his '*Stimmbücher*.' The author of this melody is probably Luther's friend, Cantor Johann Walther of Torgau. He presented to 'the dear man of God' a manuscript collection of sacred songs, in which exists the first copy of that grand melody. . . . Probably Luther's work as a hymn composer consisted in providing new texts for old Catholic church hymns and fitting some of the melodies to his songs. It is notorious that a series of the hymns ascribed to Luther existed long before the Reformation, as, e.g., the melodies, '*Gott sei gelobet und gebenediet*,' '*Komm heiliger Geist*,' '*Herre Gott*,' '*Mitten wir im Leben sind*,' '*Gelobet seist du Jesu Christ*,' and others, which in 'the choral books' of Kuhnau and Gebhard are set down as certainly written by Luther. Some melodies of Luther's hymn-book were borrowed by Luther without a change, in others the alteration from pre-Lutheran Latin hymns can be shown, as, e.g., the melody '*Jesus Christus unser Heiland*' is manifestly taken from an old pilgrimage song, '*In Gottes Namen fahren wir*,' which occurs in Oleari's third Hymn-Book of 1525, and as late as 1610 in a collection of old Catholic hymns published at Cologne. The melody, '*Der du bist drei in Einigkeit*,' is an old song, '*O lux beata Trinitas*' and the two melodies '*Christum wir sollen loben schon*,' and, '*Komme Gott Schöpfer, heiliger Geist*,' are adaptations of the Latin hymns, '*A solis ortus cardine*' and '*Veni Sancte*

Spiritus.' The hymns '*Nun komm der Heiden Heiland,*' and '*Herr Gott, dich loben wir,*' may easily be traced back to the hymns, '*Veni Redemptor gentium*' and '*Te Deum laudamus.*'"¹

Thus has historical research dealt with the legends of Luther and the Reformation. In the face of these results it was natural that even men born and trained in the Protestant faith should doubt the benefits and necessity of Luther's schism. "Could not the Church have been reformed from within?" asks Prof. Paulsen. "The attempts in the fifteenth century to reform the clergy and the monasteries had not been as unsuccessful as is often asserted. Might not the abuses in church government and worship (*Kultus*) have been put down without breaking up the unity of the Church? The use of spiritual powers for secular purposes, probably the worst among all the evils of the Church, depended perhaps not so much on the nature of the institution as on certain transient political conditions. . . . It would be foolish, also, to maintain that without Luther's intervention things would have remained as they were. Humanism would have continued its action; 'barbarism' would have been banished by 'culture,' and 'culture' would not have been the result. The historico-philological and mathematico-physical investigations started by humanism would have gone on and produced their results. The Church would have cherished in her bosom the new sciences as she had cherished the old, and all the wretched struggle against science, in which the Church has wasted her strength, would not have taken place. The peace which existed between the hierarchy and science up to the outbreak of the Church revolution would have continued, and the historical development of man would have gone forward more easily and more gradually."²

What inference must be drawn from our study of the results of modern historical science? That the Church and the Papacy have reason to fear true scientific and impartial historical criticism and research? that their safety lies in darkness and concealment? On the contrary, our study leads us to infer that Leo XIII. knew thoroughly what he was saying when he maintained that history is "one of the arms most fit to defend the Church." Already modern historical science has tracked and run down many errors and fables; already it has confuted many slanders and scattered much prejudice; already it has surrounded the Church with a halo of glory to which even non-Catholics cannot close their eyes. History, profane and ecclesiastical, as we have said above, does not directly attack or defend the essentials or main sup-

¹ Allg.; Deutsche Musik-Zeitung, November 9th, 1883,—Luther und die Musik—for the fourth centenary of Luther by Otto Lessmann, quoted in *Geschichtslügen*, p. 353.

² Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts*, p. 132.

ports of the Church ; these are in the hands of theology. But history has great power to open men's eyes and to dispel their prejudices. Review the roll of eminent historians that have been led back to the Church by their studies. Ekkard, Voigt, Hurter, Gfrörer, Onno Klopp, Schlosser, Bowden, the Stevensons, occur to our memory without effort. Bear in mind the powerful impression produced by Janssen's "*History of the German People*," the many conversions reported to have been wrought by it. Nor need we wonder at these effects. The hate of Rome and the Church has always been as much the product of political defamation as of religious invective, of politics as of bigotry. Read the history of Henry VIII. and his minister, Cromwell, of Elizabeth, of Philip of Hesse, of Maurice of Saxony. Do they impress us as religious zealots, or as astute ambitious politicians ? Read the history of the Thirty Years' War ; are Wallenstein, Richelieu, Mansfeld, Gustavus Adolphus, Oxenstierna, types of self-denying apostles, disinterested missionaries, or even of religious enthusiasts ? Give us rather Amru and Omar ; their deeds have at least a ring of honest, if brutal, fanaticism ; but the heroes of the Thirty Years, the Wallensteins and the Mansfelds, will impose on no one who does not wish to be deceived. And yet perhaps nothing has created deeper religious hate in Germany than this dreadful war. Before the Thirty Years' War, Canisius and his Jesuit brethren brought whole towns and districts back to the old faith ; before the war, as we have seen, though sixty years after Luther's revolt, the people sighed for the good old faith and the good old times ; after that deadly struggle there is nothing but bitterness and hate. Again in England, before the great Spanish Armada, two-thirds of all England were still Catholic ; afterwards there remain only scattered remnants in a few counties. Now, therefore, that historians are gradually feeling the dignity and lofty mission of their science, and see that it is one thing to be a religious or national pamphleteer, another to be a true votary of Clio, the much abused Church of Rome, as the results hitherto obtained show, will reap the benefits of the change. True, it will take years for the truth revealed by scholars to percolate down to the masses or even to the ordinary teachers of the masses. Many a pulpit will hereafter reverberate with threshed out lies ; many a godly but ignorant journal will continue to diffuse long refuted error. But even now better informed journals, more carefully compiled school-books, blush to sully their pages with all the antiquated trash ; they do honor to the truth ; they teach their readers how their fathers and grandfathers were fooled and gulled in many particulars. Even this partial acknowledgment of the truth, this partial rejection of oft repeated historical falsehoods, will teach their readers not to

take on trust every silly statement, every outrageous attack on Rome and "Romanism."

In face of results so useful, so favorable to the Church, historical science has a double claim on the attention and the respect of Catholics. They should love and cultivate it, because, as the Holy Father says, it is a witness to the truth and because it is a means most fit to defend the Church. Much, very much, remains to be done in this field. Most of the work that has relieved the Church of her odium, and awarded to her the credit that is justly her due, has been done by non-Catholics. Much of it can be found only in learned periodicals or voluminous publications, unfit for general reading. If we look into the historical reading available to the English reading Catholic, the demand, we find, is far greater than the supply. Lingard's great work is the one historical classic of which we may be proud. More than fifty years have passed since it was written; still, only a few years ago a non-Catholic firm found it profitable to publish a new edition of this ten-volume work, finer and more attractive than any previous edition. How eloquent a testimony to its worth! Brilliant writers like Macaulay and Froude have been found wanting; but Lingard enjoys the respect of Catholic and Protestant. On Church history we have the translations of Darras, of Alzog, and of Brueck, and they have supplied a crying want. But where is the English reading Catholic to go for the history of France, Germany, and Italy, the great continental European peoples whose history is the marrow of modern European history, the peoples whose history has been especially made the weapon of attack against the Papacy and the Church? There is hardly a comprehensive non-Catholic English history of these nations, nothing but monographs and fragments. Catholic works, deserving the name of history, are wholly lacking. It is precisely this condition of things that protects and prolongs the life of many an effete slander. Here, then, is a glorious field for Catholic scholars. Let them master the last results of recent research, let them analyze them carefully, let them, as the Holy Father says, dread to state an untruth, let them not fear to state the truth, and they will do yeoman's service to the Church and to their countrymen. They will have great advantages. In studying the history of pre-"Reformation" times, they will look at them, so to say, from within. A great effort must be made by the most honest non-Catholic to appreciate justly those times and their spirit; he is as far removed from them as England is from China. The Catholic, on the other hand, is much nearer to the Middle Ages, nearer, that is to say, to their religious and moral spirit. And after all, on the morality and the religion of a nation or an age, must its history chiefly hinge. Art has its glories,

learning its fame, science its grandeur; but art, and science, and learning without morality and religion cannot secure the prosperity of nations, nor stay their downfall. So the Catholic historian has a great advantage in dealing with pre-"Reformation" times, and this is often silently acknowledged by non-Catholic scholars. Let Catholic scholars, then, profit by these advantages. Let them fill up the gaps in English historical literature. Let them work in the spirit of Leo XIII., guided by the love of truth; filled with charity and moderation, let them state facts with vigor, but without venom. If they will thus set forth historic truth, they will reap the respect of all truth-lovers, Catholic and non-Catholic; they will overturn many prejudices against the Church that are already tottering, and will contribute most effectively to defend the Church.

So much for Catholic historical scholars. The layman, on his side, once he realizes the importance of history, once he clearly sees how much it can do to promote the cause of truth and religion, and to place the Church in her proper light before his non-Catholic fellow-citizens, will not fail in his duty. He will himself, no doubt, become an earnest reader of history, and will strive to interest his children in this attractive and useful, we may almost say necessary, branch of learning. He will aid and encourage historical workers, not only with his purse, but, what is more important, with his appreciation. He will help them to rescue from oblivion the noble deeds of unsung heroes and patriots and the past glories of the Church. He will learn again and again the lesson that cannot be too often taught, that all true greatness, whether in Church or State, must have its foundation in morality and religion. In fine, he will find in history new reasons to cherish and admire his Mother Church, that has done so much for mankind.

THE TENDENCY OF ENGLISH JOURNALISM.

THE English press has supplanted the Church of England in the office of final arbiter of Christian truths. The usurpation commenced about fifty years ago. Before that time it was the clergy, individually, who taught themselves and their flocks what to believe. The flocks usually reciprocated the compliment; indeed, the flocks taught as much as did the clergy; still, the system worked harmoniously in the sense that the mutual authority was at once nationally approved and put in practice. Then, as the power of the press began to grow, the mutual authority took the newspapers into partnership; so that clergy, laity and newspapers became the combined teaching-body which dictated what English Christians ought to believe. At first, it was the "religious newspapers" alone which interfered in the domain of dogmatic truth; the editors of these newspapers imagining themselves to be apostles; each one an apostle to his own party. But very soon the secular press came to discover that there was an immense deal to be made out of religion; that a judicious admixture of theological leading articles with political or painfully mundane grooves of advocacy would be sure to increase a paper's circulation by paying court to a new circle of subscribers. Thus the *Times*, forty-five years ago, apprehending that the new "Puseyism" was likely to catch the national religious taste, set to work to write up the Oxford School and to advocate High Church doctrines and ritual. For many months the *Times* confessed itself Puseyite. Then came a mysterious silence on the subject. The *Times*-feelers of the national pulse, gradually perceiving that the Protestant prejudice was in the ascendant over what was called the æsthetic craze, after a discreet interval of a few weeks, veered right around to the opposite side and boldly censured what they had so recently written up. The lesser journals took their cue from the great one. Just as to-day most of the newspapers are anti-Irish, because the *Times*, the leading journal, has set the fashion, so in those days most of the newspapers returned to Protestantism directly the great Jupiter had veered around. Still, all the papers continued to be Christian, though they turned their backs on the "new-fangled Popery." For twenty years there was no apology for freethinking. No morning, evening, weekly or monthly organ ever ventured to plead the cause of infidelity. Up to about the year 1885 there was little more than a feeling the way in such

speculations as *might* possibly lead to dangerous doubts, yet were only hazarded as the legitimate searchings after truth.

And now comes the curious fact that it was not until the country had declined to be wooed by the new Ritualism, and had at the same time given manifest indications that it would not return to the Catholic Church, that English journalism began to play fast and loose with the new freethinking, and to publish extracts from the writings of clever skeptics. Here we reach a "moral" which should be instructive to those Englishmen who pin their faith on their *ecclesia docens*, the press. It used to be urged, fifty years ago, that a "free-press" and the "whole truth" would be necessarily sympathetic experiences; that a newspaper, if untrammelled, would be sure to be first honest, then broadly comprehensive of "both sides." Protestants did not realize that a newspaper, like a shopkeeper, has to "dress the window" so as to attract the most customers; so that if "the circulation goes down" another line must be taken, another style of literary wares must be offered. What would be obvious to any commercial man of the world was never suspected by the ardent votaries of a free press. They took it for granted that the religious advocacy must be sincere; that there could not possibly be intentional *suppressio veri*; that the editor and his staff would have but one object in life, to enlighten their readers on all aspects of all truths. The exact opposite of this surmise would have been nearer the fact. The religious newspapers (we are speaking principally of the "Church organs") were simply combatants who sought to strike down their adversaries without one thought of charity or of truth-loving. To publish everything that could possibly injure an opponent, and to suppress everything that could possibly serve his cause, were the lofty maxims of the apostles at their desks. For some forty years has one Church-newspaper, *The Rock*, adopted this eminently Christian rule of life. Few issues have been without their Roman Catholic scandal, few without their travesty of Catholic truths. And the High Church organs are conducted on the same principles. The grand object being to prove the superiority of Anglican heresies, this is best done by misrepresenting Catholic truths. Here, then, we have one blessing of a "free" press. Here we have the development of that odd substitute for the Divine Church, the printed sheets of party acrimony and commercial greed. In secular newspapers such a development was a matter of course. But in religious newspapers, supposed to teach the whole of the truth, the grooved falsehoods might almost shock even the proprietors.

It would be hard to say whether the secular or the religious newspapers write the more infallibly about religion. Perhaps

there is an airy assumption about the secular organs which is the more captivating because it is so easy. The secular organs, not being hampered by responsibility (they only set up to be critics, not to be teachers), are more sublimely impartial, more disdainful of doctrinal differences, than the grooved apostles of this heresy or of that. Thus the *Daily Telegraph*, when greeting Mr. Herbert Spencer as an advocate for the doing away with Christianity, called attention to the "remarkable passages" in his arraignment, and then passed on to write about the theatres. As a secular newspaper, the *Daily Telegraph* would plead its innocence in merely quoting a score of lines from an infidel writer; the incidental circumstance that a quarter of a million readers would be told that the quoted passages were "remarkable" being perhaps unfortunate but journalistic. This is the way in which the secular newspapers do the harm, by calling attention to what would otherwise pass unheeded. The masses do not read Mr. Herbert Spencer; so the daily newswriters, being aware that his blatant infidelity is the only part of his philosophy they would understand, serve it up on a separate dish for the incitement of their palates, because its pungency will act like condiments to their morals. Fifty years ago no newspaper would have quoted such passages, still less would they have been referred to as remarkable. But this is one of the tendencies of English journalism—to sow broadcast the most poisonous tares of mental evil, utterly reckless of the harm done to the multitude. Now, the religious newspapers go on a very different tack. They abhor infidelity, and sincerely; but they perhaps abhor the Catholic Church quite as much; so they, too, publish as "remarkable" every scandal they can get hold of, which can be made to tell against the Catholic religion; while they commonly decline to publish its contradiction, still more to express regret for giving scandal. After all, there is little to choose between the two. But where the religious newspapers have the advantage of their secular rivals is in their assumption that because they *do* teach, they *can* teach. It is a curious dream of the Protestant mind—it has always been so, it must necessarily be so—that because some one must teach and no one knows who is the teacher, therefore everyone can teach who does teach. The religious newspapers, each and all, adopt this postulate. Each one claims that it can teach, for the simple reason that it does teach, though it will not allow that its opposing newspapers can teach at all. And the readers, like the writers, have their postulate. They take it for granted that because *they* approve the teaching of the particular organ for which they are content to pay their sixpence, therefore that particular organ can teach the truth; the teacher being created orthodox by the taught; graduating as infallible by

the "nobis examinadoribus satisfecit" which is given by admiring readers to their own organ. This may seem comic, but it is true. There are many thousands of English Protestants, devoted members of the Established Church, who would never permit an Anglican newspaper, albeit read by bishops, to lie upon their table or to pass their doors until they had sat in judgment on its teaching on every doctrine; had given it their pontifical sanction and approval; and so, "permissu superiorum," had suffered it to go forth to the world with the unsurpassable authority of (their) Holy See.

Let it be asked, then: What is the tendency of religious journalism so far as belief or unbelief may be prospered? There are three distinct grooves of religious journals: (1) the High Church Anglican, whether Ritualist or Moderate; (2) the Low Church Anglican, whether middle class or rabid; (3) the Dissenting, whether Sectarian or Independent—though these last, somewhat curiously, are not numerous. Now the tendency of Ritualist journalists is to abstractions. They write exclusively of purely visionary theories. They preach the necessity of authority, but abuse their bishops. They urge the duty of obedience, but scold their teachers. They proclaim themselves the ardent apostles of Catholic unity, but vilify the Catholic Church—when it disagrees with them. Four out of five High Church newspapers take this line. The old-fashioned and highly respectable *Guardian* is alone content to preach serenity and acquiescence. This organ represents "the Church of England;" not the flights and the ecstasies of the "Anglo-Catholics," nor the Puritanism *plus* the cant of the Low Church party, but the steady Churchmanship which has been the backbone of the Establishment since the days, say, of Archbishop Laud. The tendency of the *Guardian*, therefore, is to "let alone." "Quieta non movere" is its motto. Probably it is the only Church of England paper which is really practical, or which does not seek to ruin the Establishment by dividing it.

The Low Church organs are mere scandal-mongers. Their reason of being is to abuse "Popery." Their theology is sentiment, their controversy is bitterness, and their Protestantism is fib-telling about Catholics. Their tendency is to bathos or imbecility. Nor have they any strong party which they can serve. The old Evangelical party is dead and gone. It did immense good in its day by preserving the sentiment of Christianity, and with the sentiment a vast amount of practical piety. All that is left now of this really earnest party is its Puritanism without its intensity, its combativeness without its quiet faith. The tendency, therefore, of the Low Church organs is to a feminine sentimentality without backbone of creed or of much educatedness. The Ritualists have deprived Low Churchism of its historic foundation by showing up the

"Reformation" as a fraud. The Broad Churchmen have fairly driven it out of the field by expanding their own theology so as to include it. The scientific men have laughed it to scorn as a mere indulgence of feelings and emotions. As a school, it has no place among the working powers. Many so-called Evangelicals are admirable Christians; but this is from the traditions which cling to them as well as from a simple ignorance of Catholic truths. Their organs, seeming to know that their day is past, can only go on hammering away against Popery.

It would not be easy for an outsider to "class" the periodicals which are announced as being the organs of the sects. Thus, why twelve of them should be called the "twelve non-sectarian papers," or why one in particular should be entitled "Nonconformity;" why the Primitive Methodists should have only one organ, while the Wesleyans enjoy the privilege of two; or why the Baptists should require two organs to express their views, seeing that they differ so little from the Methodists; or why the Society of Friends should need two organs—unless it be for the advertisement of their good works—are all riddles which an outsider cannot guess, and which, probably, "proprietors" alone can fully solve. Some of these papers are well toned; they are amiable, philanthropic, and *not* sectarian; they are only accidentally of narrow compass, their spirit being generous and sympathetic. Dissent, being a plant of English growth, is at home in the little province of its enterprise. Not one dissenter in a hundred bears malice towards the sects which, for some caprice, are differently named to his own. Dissent is more magnanimous than is Low Churchism; certainly more so than is Ritualism or High Churchism. Nor are its organs, as a rule, nearly so bitter; though, in Scotland, the Presbyterians (who would be shocked if we called them dissenters) are normally bitter against Catholics and against Episcopalians.

But if it be asked, is the general tendency of religious journalism towards union with or separation from the Catholic Church? the answer is that the majority of the journalists are anxious that the Catholic Church should submit to *them*, but that they have not the remotest idea of submitting to the Catholic Church.

Indeed, there is no more desire for Catholic unity indicated by writers for the religious journals than there is by the writers for the secular journals. A glance at the five hundred and eighty-three daily papers of the United Kingdom, were any one disposed to run them through, would probably disclose a common indifference to every form of schism or heresy, such as might best be expressed by the word "Liberal." Religious Liberalism, with the journalists, means indifferentism. It sounds much better to say that you are tolerant of others' views than that you are without

any fixed views of your own ; yet the word Liberal means in religion, " it does not matter ;" and this is the religious Liberalism of English newspapers. The secular journals affect a superb magnanimity when they plead for " equality of rights all round ;" putting themselves in an attitude of superiority to all contentions, as though their minds were too colossal to stoop to details. Indeed, there is no subject on which the journalists are so didactic as in exhorting to the supreme duty of profound indifference. Were it possible that, in their superiority, they could grow angry, they would lash the wicked men who believe in religious dogma,—on the necessity of having a creed and of sticking to it,—with a severity that would be simply awful for them to read, and which would make them feel themselves to be criminals of deepest dye. They can forgive almost every fault except dogmatism. We all know that the unpardonable sin of the Catholic Church is in teaching that there can be only one Christianity ; but the unpardonable sin of Protestants—in the estimation of their journalists—is in the not admitting that all religions are equally good. Now, the journalists are so superior to common people that there is no fear of their tumbling (in type) into this sin. They might do it in private life ; but professionally they are impeccable, so far as to never appear to believe in anything. They write of Christianity in the abstract as a most respectable and time-honored tradition ; which, though possibly it may be only a beautiful superstition, is entitled to historic credit as an old friend. When, however, Protestants affirm that there must be dogma, the journalists say, " No, here you exceed your liberties. We permit you to believe in the fact of a redemption ; but when you insist on Christian dogma we must rebuke you ; for this is to be illiberal, and, therefore, wicked." Religious Liberalism—supposing it were possible to define it—is the right of not believing what any authority declares to be true ; and this on the ground that no authority can exist, save only by the individual approval. (We are speaking, of course, solely of Christian authority.) So that the journalists, after all, are consistent in their measure when they preach against the insisting on dogma, since dogma without authority would no more be possible than would obedience without somebody to command. But the journalists go a big step further than this ; for they preach that there *ought not* to be authority ; that it is a positive blessing to be without the necessity of believing anything ; that the joy of life is in the intellectual rambling through the possibles, with no goal but the possible arriving at the slightly probable. This postulate being granted, religious liberalism can have no difficulty in passing on to formulate certain principles ; and these are : (1) nobody knows anything for certain ; (2) therefore, common sense teaches respect

for religious ignorance. And so the journalists might define their religious liberalism in this way: "a quiet contempt for one's own convictions, because one must have a quiet contempt for other people's;" the corollary being "a quiet respect for the quiet contempt with which everybody must regard our convictions and their own." Now, when we return from this digression to the inquiry which we made just now, "Is the general tendency of religious journalism towards union with, or separation from, the Catholic Church?" we see at once that all union is out of the question where there is nothing certain about which two people can be united. And so, as a matter of fact, our five hundred and sixty-three daily papers seldom speak of the reunion of Christendom save as they would speak of the pleasant amenities of a social party; of that harmony of good breeding and good fellowship which makes life so much more agreeable, and perhaps more virtuous. A union on all points of the Christian faith is not desired, because it presupposes authority; and authority, in matters of faith, is thought to be as little desirable as, in matters of the State or household, it is thought requisite. Here, then, we have a direct tendency to continued schism. English journalism gives no sign of desiring to heal English divisions, because it treats those very divisions as not discreditable.

Is there any connection between the secular teaching of English journals and the religious ideas or impressions of English people; or does the tone or spirit of secular teaching at all affect, indirectly, the prospects of religion throughout the country? If we assume that there are four grooves in chief in popular journalism,—the political, the social, the literary, and the religious,—can these grooves at all react on one another? Undoubtedly they do. Politics affect religion in its action, in the enjoyment or the restriction of its liberties. At the present moment in England the only point where politics come into actual collision with religion is in the School Board principle of excluding religious teaching from the daily life and schooling of young people. It is not necessary here to say more on this point than that the Catholic hierarchy are contending bravely against such paganism. Some of the journals are following the counsel of Cardinal Manning, and are being taught by him what is true Liberalism, what is false.

But to speak, next, of the social groove: Can its treatment by the journalists at all affect the national religious creed? Only, of course, in the degree of the respect which it shows to what are called ethical principles. Now, here we may be reminded that the institution, "society journals," must have a tendency to enfeeble social ethics. At least, many Catholic writers have seemed to think so. Perhaps, however, this is an exaggerated estimate. It may be hazarded

that their influence is superficial. Since they spring only out of the lightest vanities of the social life, they minister only to that feeble class of persons who take delight in fashionable small-talk or in scandals. Besides, at least, they make people timorous of being "pilloried," and so exercise a certain salutary restraint. They are rather weak, perhaps, than vicious in their object. They simply proceed on the principle that, of the three levers which move society—popularly said to be vanity, love, interest—the most money is to be made out of appeals to vanity. That they are shamelessly personal is, at once, their greatest fault and their most powerful attraction to their readers. Indeed, the breadth of their personalities is their real offence. It is quite a new offence in "respectable" journalism. Twenty years ago a "fashionable column" in the *Morning Post* was all the pabulum which Vanity Fair could find to feed upon. Now, we have hundreds of columns every week, in some couple of dozen so-called society papers, which are intended to inform "the people" of what the "upper ten thousand" do, and to introduce them (in print only) to their drawing-rooms. Yet the tendency of such journalism is rather to excite curiosity than to do harm by lifting the veil from private lives. Bad taste, bad form, would be the severest imputation which such very morbid journalism could be said to merit. In the very fact that they tell us that they intend to be personal—that they exist only to gossip of persons who are "in society,"—we are forewarned of the thin ice they are about to tread upon; and we know that actions for libel dog their steps. So that the danger is, perhaps, more to themselves than to their readers. Besides, they cannot be said to be more personal than are the newspapers. And, unquestionably, there is more harm done by personal writing in the newspapers than there is by personal writing in the "society papers." In the newspapers we are not forewarned of the professed purpose. We take up a morning paper, and find that a man's honesty has been grossly assailed in a leading article; and this, too, on the sole ground that his politics happen to be unpalatable to the editor (or the proprietor) of the "organ." (We must speak of this scandal in connection with social ethics, because it is common to most classes of English papers.) Thus, Mr. Gladstone is spoken of by a Tory journal as a man who is "too obviously without even a shred of sincerity in his character." The Irish members of Parliament are dismissed by a titled Tory as "men who accept money to ruin their country." Mr. Parnell is accused of writing shameless letters—of which the origin is astutely hid by the *Times* newspaper—and the Tory party acquiesce in this facile method of throwing mud, without inquiring even "what is the authority?" In some of the religious papers per-

sonalities are equally common. A Protestant bishop is spoken of by a Ritualist journal as "a mere Dissenter who likes to stick to the loaves and fishes;" while converts to the Catholic Church have been pronounced by one censor as "men of weak intellect or weaker character." Thus personalities are used as perfectly legitimate weapons, even to the extent of trying to ruin men's characters. It is true that nothing so disgraceful as the libels on Mr. Parnell has been known in the "respectable" journalism of the last fifty years; but the *spirit* of the attack is common to most newspapers, which hope to prosper their tactics by personalities. Now, this tendency is growing in force from year to year. It would be platitude to speak of its vileness or its meanness.

Let us refer to another tendency, equally contemptible with personalities, and born of the same malice of partisanship. The suppression of truth, with the false "reporting" of opponents, is quite a recognized institution in party journalism. (We find this vice rampant in all the four grooves of journalism—the political, the social, the literary, and the religious.) One or two ordinary examples may be given. Thus, if a Home Ruler makes a speech, it is cut short by hostile journals so as to thin its force or make it quite pointless. If a thousand facts in Ireland all tend in one direction, but one fact seems to tend in another, then the thousand facts are ignored, but the one fact is made the subject of a highly ethical and didactic leading article. If the Pope issues an Encyclical against heresies, not a word of it is quoted in an English journal; but, if he writes to the Irish bishops to condemn exceptional tactics, there is not a newspaper that does not claim him for its authority. A hundred such examples might be enumerated. Thus, Suppression and Personalities are the two favorite weapons of what are called party-organs in Church and State.

As to literature—which we referred to as a fourth groove in the popular press—new books are reviewed by most journalists in precisely the same spirit of partisanship. Each organ notices the books of its own party, but either ignores or makes light of its opponents'. This is as true of the "Church" organs as of the secular ones. Thus, reviewing is made to indirectly affect religion, by misrepresenting approved authors. Put together, then, the three grooves of the secular journals—the political, the social, and the literary—and it is obvious that, either directly or indirectly, the tendency must be injurious to the fourth groove, which is religion treated only diplomatically.

This whole subject of "party organs" is so difficult, if viewed ethically, that it would need the wisdom of the Holy See to give judgment on it. No one denies that a party organ must be one-sided. It would have no reason of being if it were not so. But,

need a party organ be both unjust and ungenerous? English journalism is now worked on this principle: That to prove his case, at all cost, is the duty of the journalist; *not* to prove what is true, what is just. "We do not want the truth," the writer of a leader seems to say; "what we want is to prove *ourselves* right." Exactly as a counsel in a court of justice says all that can possibly be said for his own side, and all that can possibly be said against the other side; so, a writer of a leading article ignores every consideration but such as may make his view seem the right one. But, in a court of justice, the jury hear both sides. In a newspaper the readers read only one side. And, since nine men out of ten read only their party organs, they never get to know anything of the other side. Here, then, is a tendency which is positively corrupting—to men who have not the strength of mind to read both sides. They who have lived much in the editorial atmosphere—and writers of leading articles have this experience—know that any offence is pardonable save the "stultifying" of a newspaper by making it unsay what it said the day before. If a wagon-load of evidence were to arrive at an editor's door, proving his statements on the previous day to be all fibs, he would simply comment on the wagon-load as "angry protests against our statements, which are obviously biassed by a strong party feeling." *He* has, of course, no party feeling. And behind his back stands the proprietor of the newspaper, who is inquiring about the "increase in the circulation," and who would rather his editor made a hundred slips in grammar than that he should "stultify the paper" by one apology. Papers are published, first, to make money. Editors have to labor, first, to please proprietors. The staff have to write, first, to "preserve the unities of the organ," which, in plain truth, means to shape conscience to diplomacy. The best contributor is he who attracts the most customers. A free press means the *right* of attracting customers. Take away the merchandise out of newspapers, and how much would be left of pure motive?

In these days not one paper in twenty can manage to pay its way without advertisements. But the advertisements depend largely on the circulation, so that, to secure the prop of the paper, the first object of the proprietor must be to secure the popularity of his advocacy. Now, human nature must be supposed to influence even proprietors. It is not every man who will throw away a thousand a year for the lofty pleasure of perfectly satisfying his own conscience. Merchandise is, after all, but a game of chess, in which the pawns, which are called "our principles," are meant to cover the big pieces, which are (speaking proprietorially) the profits. And since a free press was established, the poor pawns have been pushed forward with a splendid pretence of being the important

pieces on the board, while, alas, the bishops and knights, the castles, kings and queens, have been the humble instruments of the "balance" to the proprietors. The few papers which have been edited solely for truth's sake have almost invariably come to grief. Such has been the irony of a "free" press. Nor is it wholly the fault of the proprietors. Readers of newspapers insist on having what they want, and, if they get what they do not want, they write to the manager: "Sir, please cease to send me your paper." So that readers make the papers what they are. The tendency of English journalists is to gross unfairness, because the tendency of English readers is to gross prejudice.

But apart from such general characteristics, which are common, more or less, to all journalism, let it be asked, what are the present tendencies of English newspapers, in the way of advocacy of one extreme or another? Politically, the tendency is to a hard Toryism, out of a fear of the extreme sects of revolutionists. Since Radicalism and Socialism grew rampant, Toryism has grown harder and more cruel. The present spirit of English journals, in regard to Ireland, is an illustration of the reaction to wilful hardness. Not only are all the morning papers save one, and all the evening papers save two, devoted to what is understood by "Balfourism," but even the Sunday papers—supposed to be written for "the people"—are, with one exception, anti-Irish. The "weeklies" are all set in the same direction, with only two conspicuous exceptions. The bitterness of English journalism against the fighters for Irish liberties has had no parallel since the days of "No Popery." Here, then, is a tendency to partisanship which has no redeeming feature of natural kindness, nor the faintest instinct of justice to other peoples. Ignorance may be a good plea for the multitude; but the upper and the middle classes set their teeth against the Irish, wholly forgetful of the awful past of Irish wrongs, and wholly insensible to the natural duty of reparation. The newspapers take this side, with the majority, because their interests, for the moment, seem to suggest it, and because they fear that they will be suspected of Radical leanings if they venture to write honestly about Ireland. English journalism is unjust to the Irish, because it is afraid of English prejudice and susceptibility.

So that, politically, the tendency of English journalism is to resist the waves of democracy by being *more* Tory. This might be all very well if it were not an apparent probability that the "one man one vote" principle will be soon adopted. But it must seem unwise to try to irritate those classes which, before long, will have increased political power, instead of magnanimously and chivalrously doing justice, so as to take the "reason of being" out of revolution. And we may see another example of this stolid Toryism

in the attitude of the press towards the House of Lords. Nothing could be more lamentable, politically, than the obliteration of a "second, revising chamber." Yet all the world recognizes that the legislative unfitness of at least three-quarters of the House of Peers is so manifest that custom alone could let it stand. Now the press will not attack this (known) anomaly, for fear of being suspected of being Radical. The exactly opposite course would be less Radical. For, if now, in times of peace, the Upper House could be reconstituted, there would be no fear of its being pulled down in times of trouble; whereas, should we have our revolution, the House of Lords would "go first," and the Throne would be not unlikely to follow it. Here, then, is another example of the tendency of English journalism to oppose Radicalism by a fictitious warmth of Toryism. Ireland and the House of Lords are two very good examples of this tendency to immobility or stolidity.

As to religion, what has been said might suffice, save that it is desirable to notice more particularly the *interest* which some journalists take in skepticism. A glance at the British magazines, periodicals and reviews, numbering about twelve hundred and twenty, and also at the London weekly or interval papers, numbering about three hundred and ninety, discloses a spirit of interest in skepticism which is much stronger than that of repugnance to unbelief. Some of the scientific papers profess atheism. Most of them look down upon Christian dogma. Some few are emphatic in proclaiming their theism; but the belief is often qualified by "natural religion." There is no scientific paper which affects to connect its science with the profession of belief in the Church of England, perhaps for the simple reason that no scientist, no logician, could connect certain truth with private sentiment. A belief in Christianity is one thing, but a belief in the Church of England is another. All that we find in such scientific papers as profess religion is the assertion that creation manifestly points to a Creator; not, as St. Thomas shows, that the philosophy of Catholicity is in harmony with the whole suggestion of the universe. But what is the general tendency of science papers? Is it towards faith or unbelief? Towards faith, inferentially, yet chiefly towards natural religion. As to the bulk of the interval papers—weekly, monthly, or quarterly—they mostly ignore religion altogether. Nor can we, reasonably, expect that, say, the class periodicals, numbering eight hundred and forty-five, should combine a subject which is outside their province with the interests of exceptional trades. Indeed, it is better that they should leave it alone. They do not pretend, like the "popular" papers, to know everything. Our point is that the daily papers—and not a few of the weeklies—treat religion as they treat politics or sociology, except that their enthusiasm about the latter is not extended to their discussions about the former.

"The number of people who take the trouble to think for themselves is very small indeed," as Mr. Puff says, in Sheridan's comedy of "The Critic"; so the journalists have to take the trouble to think for them, and the operation is commonly performed in this way—at least, on the part of the "religious journals": "I want you," says the editor of such a journal to one of his staff, "to write me an article on Ritualism. Be careful to steer clear of committing the paper to any approval of Ritualist practices; yet, at the same time, do not say a word in discouragement of the party, because a number of our subscribers are Ritualists. You might throw in some platitudes about the hard-working Ritualist clergy, their undeniable zeal, and all that sort of thing; but you had better also express a general regret that they do not more consult their congregations as to the acceptability of new doctrines or practices. You see the line? The fact is, we went a little too far in our somewhat hurriedly-written leader of last week, and I have been deluged with correspondence in consequence. Observe the *juste milieu*. Don't commit us."

And the readers are mostly satisfied with the "admirable prudence and moderate counsel" which the leader of the following week puts before them.

So that we might sum up the whole tendency of English journalism—in its relations to what may be called religious views—as the suggesting to readers that they should suggest to their journalists the sort of teaching they want to have suggested back again. Reciprocity is the amiable idea; but the readers must begin first, or the journalists cannot insist earnestly—with an air of authority—that the readers should believe what they want to believe. Then, when the journalist proceeds to lay down the law, the readers are delighted with his sagacity, not considering that he has been instructed to write what he does write, because it is exactly what the readers want to have. A mutual complimentary society is what is really established by the proprietor, the staff, and the readers. It is a harmonious and a successful arrangement. Still, regarded from a supernatural point of view, it is lacking in some essentials of infallibility.

As to the future, a multiplication of such advocacies is all that we have reason to expect. Meanwhile, Catholic newspapers are on the increase. What is wanted is a Catholic daily paper, and also a Catholic quarterly review. It is certainly high time that English Catholics had a quarterly review of their own. Three years ago a private gentleman tried to start one, but he met with obstacles which tempered his enthusiasm. In the same spirit, ten years ago, a private gentleman tried to start a London Catholic daily paper, but only half of the necessary funds could be guaran-

teed. It is lamentable that political bias is so strong among English Catholics that the Irish question alone fatally divides them. A daily paper, which should advocate Irish liberties, would not be patronized by a large section of English Catholics.

On religion alone would English Catholics be united; and it is just exactly on that one subject that no existing daily paper ever sounds the true note of Catholicity, or even affects to feel so much as scholarly interest.

A NEW BIOGRAPHER OF OUR LORD.

UNDER the enticing title, "The Boyhood of Christ,"¹ appears one of the handsomest and best printed and illustrated books, perhaps, ever seen in this country. Not large in size—it consists only of 101 pages—but magnificently gotten up, and accompanied with thirteen exquisite plates, most of them splendid copies from paintings by the great masters, the book has been intended—so at least it appears—to serve as a holiday present of the most attractive character, and reach, if it were possible, every Christian home, not only in this land, but in every other where the English language is understood or spoken. What Christian mother, in coming across a book of this character, on such a sweet and interesting subject, suggestive of the tenderest as well as most poetical feelings of the heart, and so beautiful and artistic in its external form, would not be at once inclined to give to it a prominent position among the choicest ornaments of her parlor? And what man, or woman, whether single or married, whether advanced in age or still in the prime of life, who admires what is beautiful and feels towards a child, even if that child is not our Divine Lord, that profound reverence, as well as sympathy, which innocence and purity inspire at all times and force themselves into our hearts, could resist the temptation of bringing to his wife, or to a beloved mother, or daughter, or sister, such an interesting and refined present as the book now referred to might apparently constitute?

And then, if it should happen for the looker-on to turn the title page and read the dedication, "To the soul of my mother," who

¹ *The Boyhood of Christ*, by Lew Wallace, author of *Ben Hur* and *The Fair God*, illustrated.

could resist the temptation of taking with him the book and anticipating a noble, elevating and purifying enjoyment?

True it is that at once something in the title page itself might be found capable, if not of chilling the blood of the reader, even if he is not in any way pious, at least of causing him to desire that such a thing would have been omitted. Why did the author of "The Boyhood of Christ" add to his name that he was also the author of "Ben Hur" and "The Fair God"? Did he intend to forewarn that he was a writer of fiction and that "The Boyhood of Christ" was to be written also under the rules pertaining to compositions of that kind, and with no other sentiment than the one inspiring a more or less sensational novel? Could he have forgotten so completely the well-admitted maxim, proclaimed even by heathens, that "holy things must be treated holily,"—*Sancta sancte tractanda*?

Mr. Wallace's heart made him feel the necessity to explain to the public why he had written this book. People would ask, or wonder, he says, why he, who is "neither minister of the Gospel, nor theologian, nor churchman," had "presumed" to give this work to the public. "It pleases him," he says, "to answer respectfully" that he did so "to fix an impression distinctly in his mind." And this impression was that "the Jesus Christ in whom he believes was, in all the stages of his age, a human being," and that "his divinity was the Spirit within him, and the Spirit was God."

Whatever might be said of this reason and of its soundness both theologically and philosophically, it must be taken for granted that for the author at least it is satisfactory. It is not, besides, in any form or manner, the subject of our inquiry.

The plan of the book is certainly calculated to inspire interest. An old man, Uncle Midas, who had seen the world, and been a lawyer and a soldier, an author and a traveller, and had dabbled in art, diplomacy and politics,—exceedingly refined in his manners,—who had visited Turkey and Palestine, and had, after reaching his sixty-fifth year, retired to live with ease and comfort, surrounded by his books and his mementoes, is visited a Christmas eve by some young people, who rather like to hear him talking than abandoning themselves to the pleasures of dancing, and suggest as an appropriate subject of the conference the boyhood of Christ.

Uncle Midas had his library, where the conversation passed, near a greenhouse where he treasured with care a palm tree which the monks of Mar Saabe had given him, a vine which he had brought from a garden near the walls of Jerusalem, and an oak from Mamre. Flowers suggested to him only their transient

glory and beauty. But these mementoes and his books helped him to keep his mind well balanced and contented.

Nan and Puss are two girls, just verging on womanhood, who delight in listening to the old man, and desert the ball-room to come to his study. "We have come to hear you talk," says one of them, with the charming but somewhat abrupt frankness natural to her age. And while the strains of the music occasionally reach the room, as if recalling them, although in vain, to the pleasures which they have foregone for the moment, the subject of the boyhood of Christ is suggested by them.

"It is so hard," says Puss, "to think of our Lord as a boy. I mean to say," she adds, "to think of Him running, jumping, playing marbles, flying kites, spinning tops and going about all day on mischiefs, such as throwing stones and robbing birds' nests."

And to this the old man whom the subject suggested gives pleasure, answers with a grave smile: "Rest, you little friend, if the Nazarene lads of his day had tops, marbles and kites,—I am not sure they had,—I would prefer to believe he found enjoyment in them."

Shortly afterwards a lad, named John, came to join the listeners; and later on some other people, of about the same age, also escaped from the dancing-hall and swelled the attentive audience.

All of this seems, no doubt, exceedingly interesting. An old man, on Christmas eve, talking of the Child Jesus to children who are anxious to know all about the boyhood of the Redeemer, certainly affords a subject for a most charming composition, whether literary or in painting. Purity, sanctity, innocence, beauty in its most sympathetic and charming form, had necessarily to be the canvas or the background upon which Uncle Midas was called to put, as if it were in contact, the Child who was God with the children born of men, who were anxious to know Him. What a great opportunity for the elevation of minds, for the infusion of religious feelings, for promoting attachment to divine things, for rendering the Church and her teachings amiable and interesting!

But, alas, how distant Mr. Wallace has been from attaining these results!

This book, besides being disappointing to the last extreme, is a living and perpetual contradiction of its own purposes and ideas. It was conceived, as the author says, to fix distinctly in his mind that our Lord was, in all the stages of His life, a human being—and when Puss says to Uncle Midas that it is hard for her to think of our Lord as a boy, as if He had been like the other boys, sons of men, he said, as we have seen, that he would prefer to believe

that the Child Jesus found enjoyment in the juvenile amusements and plays of all times and places.

As Puss, astonished, as it seems, by the idea suggested by the old man, exclaimed almost with reproach, "Oh, Uncle Midas!" as meaning, how is it possible that a man of his good sense and judgment could set forth such a strange proposition, Uncle Midas became serious; his "smile vanished," and he answers the girl: "I see that you are going the way of the many; by and by you will not be able to think of our Lord as a man!"

And nevertheless, when all the pages are read, when the talk of Uncle Midas is finished—when the whole story is told—the conclusion which is reached is the absolute and complete denial of the idea that apparently pervades the book, and seemed to be paramount in Uncle Midas's mind. The conclusion is that "Christ had no boyhood at all." The book ends by a request, on the part of Uncle Midas, to be pardoned by his audience for his attempt to convince them; that, in fact, our Lord was never a boy.

And, indeed, such pardon is necessary, not only for the strange inconsistency between the premises and the conclusion based upon them, but for the spirit of disguised, although, perhaps, unintentional, irreverence which shows itself through the narrative.

Uncle Midas speaks of his attachment to Christ because of His human nature. God is so far beyond his comprehension that he gives up in despair. But for Christ, how different his feelings are. He is His friend, His brother; Uncle Midas could have borne to look into His face. He could have even laid his head fearlessly upon His breast. And as he finds it amazing that the "childhood of such a man should be so beggarly of authentic incident," he entertains his audience, and answers to their questions, by reading from a book which he keeps in his library simply as a monument of the capability to believe even absurd things which in his judgment exists in man. This book, which he alleges to be the only one on the subject, though there is another, he says, not worthy to be mentioned, for its extreme inferiority, is the one which he calls "The First Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus Christ," and which he hastens to say that he dislikes because the stories that it tells "detract from the exceeding holiness of the personages of whom they are told," and because they are "trifling and puerile."

But as the children crowded around him are anxious to hear what is said in that book, Uncle Midas selects carefully what he can find in it more readily admitting of stern criticism, and even caricature, and tries to impress upon the minds of his listeners the wrong idea that the pious author of the "Book of the Miracles of our Saviour, and Lord, and Teacher, Jesus Christ, which is called

the Gospel of the Infancy," as the work is really named, represents the Holy Family as seeking for entertainments, being given presents, and our Blessed Lady as a "showwoman of the miraculous powers of her Son," whom "she exhibits in the towns along the way" during her pilgrimage to Egypt.

The circumstance must perhaps be noticed, that in reaching this point, and when, indeed, the real subject of the boyhood of our Lord, with which the book is intended to deal, begins to be discussed, no less than 73 pages out of the 101 which the whole work contains have been already filled with preliminary remarks and a *mise en scène*.

The tales of devils cast out only by the contact with linen belonging to the infant Saviour, which His blessed Mother had washed and hung somewhere to be dried; and the story of the robbers whom the legend says the holy travelers met after they reached Egypt; and that of the idols which fell down with a crash at the simple approach of the Child-God to the magnificent temples where they were worshipped; and that of St. Joseph being a bad carpenter, and that our Lord often came to his assistance, to correct his errors in his measurements, or straighten properly what he had done crookedly or imperfectly, are all picked up and related isolatedly, deprived of the charms of the oriental poetry with which they were adorned, and, more than this, stripped wholly of the pious and reverent spirit with which they were written and have been preserved for centuries, not only in the eastern countries, but everywhere else—Uncle Midas's intention having been, apparently, to draw from his listeners emphatic exclamations of surprise and even of disgust, and, perhaps, scandal, as if something blasphemous, or utterly shocking in some other respect, had been uttered in their presence.

What a great injustice, however, he did to this book, and to the various others which he did not mention, or did not know of, which relate to this subject!

The "Gospel of the Infancy," copies of which in manuscript, in Arabic, and in Syriac, are preserved in the library of the Vatican at Rome and in the National Library at Paris, and which has been printed in the two languages aforesaid, and in most, if not all, the modern languages, was originally believed, by the people among whom it appeared, to have been written by St. Peter, upon material furnished him by the Blessed Virgin. Probably in its present form it was made up by some Nestorian writer; which accounts, among other things, for the great favor that it always enjoyed among the followers of Nestorianism. It was natural that the believers, not only in the two natures of our Lord and Saviour, but in the existence in Him of two persons, distinctly different, one from the other,

would have tried to treasure as many traditions as they could find among the people, which related directly to the childhood of Christ. Its popularity, especially in Egypt, where most of the facts that it narrates took place, has been maintained for centuries perfectly unabated. It has still great credit among the Copts, who possess, in addition to this book, a great number of others, dwelling upon the same subject, one of which is a "History of the Flight into Egypt," falsely attributed to Theophilus of Alexandria.

The works above cited, and the "History of Joseph the Carpenter," the "Protoevangelion of James the Less," the "Gospel of Thomas the Israelite, on the things done by the Lord when still an Infant," the "Gospel of the Nativity of Saint Mary," the "Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, and of the Infancy of the Saviour," and several others, are certainly interesting monuments, which irrefutably testify to the movements of the human mind at a period of history exceedingly worthy of attention. They are not monuments, as Uncle Midas thought, of that kind of imbecile, indiscriminate aptness to believe all things, no matter how absurd, which he ascribes to mankind; but monuments of literature, as well as of pious and religious feeling, wherein the charms of poetry have been lavishly poured down, and wherein the purest intention and good faith had been displayed at all parts.

In these legends of the Evangelic times, always shining with candor and good intention, where traditions dear to the people have been carefully preserved, the soul and life of the Christian society of the day are to be found portrayed. They were destined for the family circle, to be narrated at home, under the tent, at the foot of the palm-trees, where the caravan halted; and a good picture of the popular customs of the primitive Church is preserved by them. They were the popular poems of the first neophytes of the new worship; and faith and imagination vied with each other to render them interesting and beautiful. The Church, in her wisdom, has not admitted them as canonical, but recognized, with reason, that they lack authenticity; but her action has stopped at this point, no doctrine against the faith having been found in them. Their influence, on the other hand, has been extraordinary, because for many centuries they have contributed powerfully and directly to the development of poetry and the fine arts. The epic and dramatic art of the Middle Ages, as well as painting and sculpture, have largely drawn from these legends. Christian art owes to them its origin; and as Balmez has justly remarked, "In whatever manner we may judge of them, and even if we attempt to altogether set them aside as mere illusions, the fact remains that they are harmless, and have contributed immensely to the glories of art, the cultivation of sentiment, and the civilization of the world."

It would have been, no doubt, better for Uncle Midas to entertain his innocent, attentive listeners with stories like the ones still told to the travelers in Egypt, about the miracles and innocent deportment of the Child-God, than to plant into their souls, prematurely, the spirit of doubt and adverse criticism, if not a kind of Puritanic horror of any mild form or expression of human nature.

People who have visited Cairo, or occupied themselves with these subjects, remember a small stream of fresh, delicious water which flows in the vicinity of that city, and is bordered with fragrant balm shrubs. The water elsewhere in that territory is salty and bitter. The shrubs cannot thrive except on the particular spot which the privileged stream can wash. In answer to any questions about the reasons of this striking fact, they will explain to you the same now as many centuries ago, that Mary washed at that spring the clothing of her Divine Son, that the water became then purified and wholesome, and that wherever a drop of it fell upon the ground a balm-tree sprang up at once, fragrant and luxurious.

They will tell you, also, with that richness of imagination that is characteristic of eastern people, why a branch of the palm-tree has been chosen, as if by common consent of the human race, to symbolize triumph or victory. In a fatiguing journey through the desert, a palm-tree having been seen at a distance, Mary suggested to Joseph, "Let us repose a little under its shade"; and Mary, having sat down, cast a glance at the top of the palm-tree, and saw that it was loaded with fruits; and she said to Joseph, "My wish should be, if possible, to have one of those fruits." And then the child, Jesus, who was in the arms of the Virgin Mary, said to the palm-tree: "Tree, bend down thy crown, and give my mother thy fruits." And then, at His voice, the palm-tree inclined its head until it touched the feet of Mary; and Mary collected as much of the fruit as she wanted. . . . And Jesus said (on the following day): "I say to thee, palm-tree, . . . and I grant thee as a blessing, that of all who shall conquer in the battles of faith, it shall be said forever, 'You have obtained the palm of victory.'"—(History of the Nativity of Mary and the Infancy of the Saviour.)

Stories of this kind at Christmas eve might have been more edifying, and perhaps more acceptable, to Uncle Midas's audience than his stern criticisms, and his attempt, as he himself calls it, to show that our Lord, although so extremely a man, as he said, had had no boyhood.

He was well aware, nevertheless, that this peculiar point of view was at least novel. "Opinion commonly held, he said, that the youth of our Lord ran on in a course very much like that of the generality of poor Jewish children." But as Puss remarked impulsively, "with a show of indignation," that she could not

believe such a thing, Uncle Midas looked at her "benignantly," and said, "Nor can I, either."

Another novel feature of Uncle Midas's narrative is the effort that he made to destroy the idea, thus far prevailing, that the Holy Family was poor, and that St. Joseph had to rely upon his work as a carpenter for the support of his household.

"They say," he went on, "that Joseph, to whom as a child our Lord was subject, was a carpenter who plied only the humbler branches of the trade, and that Mary, his wife, spun the flax and wool for the family, and was a housewife. These are the circumstances chiefly relied upon," he continues, "to support the theory that the condition of the child was poverty. Now, while I admit the circumstances, I deny the conclusion. That Joseph was a carpenter signifies nothing, as the law required every Israelite, rich or poor, to follow some occupation. Now, was it not written of the exemplar of all the mothers in Israel, 'she looketh to the way of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness?' And if we may give heed to accounts not purely scriptural, Mary owned the house in Nazareth in which the family dwelt; but, conforming to the Scriptures, it is to be remembered that amongst the gifts of the Magi there was gold, and I please myself thinking that there was enough of it to support the Holy Family while it was in Egypt and afterwards in Nazareth. . . . As to the social position of the family, it is enough to remember that, besides being a just man, Joseph was a lineal descendant of David the king."

From these premises Uncle Midas drew the conclusion that the Holy Family was "neither rich nor poor," that its condition was "comfortable," "exactly the condition to allow our Saviour a marginal time in which to taste something of natural boyish freedom, . . . to have little playmates, run races with the youngest of the flock, deck himself from the anemone-beds on the hills, and watch the clouds form slowly about the summit of Mount Hermon."

If the view thus presented were historically correct, the world must have remained for nineteen centuries under a permanent cloud of error and misrepresentation. The lesson which the always taken-for-granted condition of poverty, and dependence upon manual labor, of the Holy Family has taught to the human race, and has so efficiently contributed to alleviate social evils and render the burdens of the unfortunate lighter or more supportable, would henceforth be lost and unwarranted.

Fortunately, neither the unchanged and universal tradition of mankind, nor historical monuments of irrefutable character, can allow the subversive views of Uncle Midas, upon the supposed "comfortable" position of the Holy Family, to be entertained for a moment. So well settled the contrary assertion proves to be,

that even Protestant writers, and among them men of such immense learning and information as Alfred Edersheim, author of "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," not certainly well disposed either in favor of our Church or in favor of the legends above referred to, and so severely criticised by Uncle Midas, have not hesitated to maintain it boldly and squarely. "At the time of their betrothal," says Edersheim, "alike Joseph and Mary *were extremely poor*, as appears, not indeed from his being a carpenter, since a trade was regarded as almost a religious duty, but from the offering at the presentation of Jesus in the Temple."

According to the law (Leviticus, chapter xii., v. 6), the said offering should consist, under ordinary circumstances, of a lamb one year old for a burnt-offering, and a turtle-dove for a sin-offering (*agnum anniculum in holocaustum et pullum columbæ, sive turturem, pro peccato*); but when the mother was not able to get the lamb—which, like all other offerings, could be bought at the Temple—then the offering should be two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, one for the burnt-offering and the other for the sin-offering. (*Quod si non invenerit munus ejus, nec potuerit offerre agnum, sumet duos turtures, vel duos pullos columbarum, unum in holocaustum, et alterum pro peccato.* Lev. xii., 8.)

And St. Luke says explicitly (chapter ii., v. 24) that the offering of the Blessed Virgin, in presenting her Divine Son at the Temple, was, according to the latter provision, a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons.

Tertullian says that Mary earned her livelihood by working; and Celsus, in the second century, said that Mary was a woman who had lived by the work of her hands.

The general tradition of mankind, and the expression given to it by art, is, and has been at all times, that St. Joseph brought up the Divine Child as a carpenter, and that Jesus exercised the craft of his foster-father. This touching and familiar aspect of the life of our Saviour, as Mrs. Jameson says (Legends of the Madonna), is specially treated in pictures painted for private oratories, and in prints prepared for distribution among the people, and became specially popular during the religious reaction of the seventeenth century. "The greatest and wisest Being who ever trod the earth was thus represented, in the eyes of the poor artificer, as ennobling and sanctifying labor and toil; and the quiet, domestic duties and affections were here elevated and hallowed by religious associations, and adorned by all the graces of art. Even when the artistic treatment was not first-rate, . . . still, if the sentiment and significance were but intelligible to those especially addressed, the purpose was accomplished, and the effect must have been good."

Had Uncle Midas in his library that pretty little book of Mrs.

Jameson's, which has just been cited, he might have read to his young visitors the beautiful description of a set of twelve prints executed in the Netherlands, exhibiting a sort of history of the childhood of our Lord, and His training under the eye of His mother, which is there made. This set of prints has for its title *Jesu Christi Dei Domini Salvatoris nostri Infancia*, and represents different domestic scenes highly interesting. In one of them St. Joseph is working as a carpenter, the Blessed Virgin is measuring linen, and the Divine Child blowing soap-bubbles. In another the Blessed Virgin is reeling off a skein of thread, St. Joseph preparing a plank, and Jesus, assisted by two angels, picking up the chips. In another St. Joseph is building up the framework of a house, and Jesus boring a hole with a large gimlet, while the Blessed Virgin is winding thread.

St. Justin, the Martyr, mentions, as a tradition of his time, that our Lord assisted St. Joseph in making yokes and ploughs. And St. Bonaventure not only describes the Blessed Virgin as a pattern of female industry, but alludes particularly to the "legend of the distaff," and mentions a tradition that, when in Egypt the Holy Family was in extreme poverty, and almost compelled to beg.

The fact that the Magi made an offering of gold, does not prove that this gold was enough to support the whole family in Egypt, and also in Nazareth, as Uncle Midas was pleased to hope; and the fact that St. Joseph was a lineal descendant of David the king is not sufficient evidence that he enjoyed the "comfortable" position in life which is ascribed to him. St. Joseph was, no doubt, a patrician, as Abbé Orsini calls him; but as the same eminent writer says ("Life of the Blessed Virgin," chapter vii.), his fortune, if any had ever been in his family, "had been absorbed by the political revolutions and religious wars of Judea, as a drop of rain is swallowed in the sea, leaving him only his tools and his arms for labor."

When one of Uncle Midas's young visitors asked him whether our Lord "did not play as other children," and whether He "did go to school," the old gentleman answered that "Jesus was preternaturally serious," and that, "if Nazareth had a school, and the better opinion is that the village was not so favored, it is to be kept in mind that scholars could not be admitted before the age of six, and that all instruction was limited to the law, and entirely oral."

With due respect to the speaker, it can be stated positively that not one of these assertions is supported by evidence. The assumption that the Divine Child, the child *par excellence*, as might be said, the most perfect, and therefore the most lovely and charming type of childhood, was nevertheless "preternaturally serious," involves a contradiction of principles which is fatal to it. Its mere enuncia-

tion makes it fall to the ground. And the ideas as to schools, and the education at Palestine at the time of the boyhood of our Lord, and the standing of Nazareth as far as learning and civilization are concerned, which Uncle Midas conveyed to his listeners, do not bear, either, too close examination.

Nazareth, as Edersheim writes, although it might seem withdrawn from the world in its enclosure of mountains, must not be thought of as a lonely village, reached only by faint echoes of what roused the land beyond. The great interests which stirred the land constantly met there. One of the great commercial routes of the world at that time led through Nazareth, and men of all nations, busy with another life than that of Israel, would appear in its streets, and through them thoughts, associations, and hopes connected with the great outside world be stirred.

On the other hand, Nazareth, was also one of the great centres of Jewish temple life, or priest centres, where the priests of the "course" which was to be on duty at the temple usually assembled in preparation for their sacred functions. "A double significance, says the learned writer above named, attached therefore to Nazareth, since through it passed alike those who carried on the traffic of the world, and those who ministered in the temple."

To say, or think, that this village was not favored with what was so common, and so well regulated, as schools were in Judea, is, to say the least, unfounded. The regular instruction of every child commenced there with the fifth or sixth year of his age. Every one of them was sent to the school. Schools were established in every town, and education was compulsory under the laws. Numerous authorities cited by Edersheim establish beyond a doubt that a city or town where there was no school was not lawfully to be inhabited by any family, and deserved to be either destroyed or excommunicated. And Jewish tradition had it that, in spite of the fabulous number of schools supposed to have existed in Jerusalem, the city fell only because of the neglect of the education of children.

These schools, sometimes called *eschule*, evidently from the Greek *scholē*, where children gathered around their teachers, were destined to impart to them, first the knowledge of the alphabet and of writing, and then onwards to the farthest limit of instruction, and were conducted with extreme care, wisdom, accuracy and a moral and religious purpose as the ultimate object. To use the language of Maimonides, from whom Edersheim quotes, "encircled by his pupils as by a crown of glory," the teacher, generally the Chazzan, or officer of the synagogue, made them familiar with the precious knowledge of the law, adapting it constantly to their capacity with

unwearied patience, intense earnestness, and, above all, with the highest object of their training ever in view.

Roughly classifying the subjects of study, it was held, as Eder-sheim explains, that up to ten years of age the Sacred Book should be exclusively the text-book. From ten to fifteen they studied the Mishnah, or traditional law. After that age the student entered into those theological and philosophical discussions which took place in the higher academies of the rabbis. The first book of the Scripture to be studied was the Leviticus. From it they passed to the other parts of the Pentateuch, and then to the Prophets, and finally to the Hagiographa or sacred writings, which completed the Scripture. What now constitutes the Gemare or Talmud was taught in the academies.—("The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," by Alfred Edersheim, Book ii. chap. 9.)

And why had the teaching to be necessarily oral? The possession of parts, if not of the whole, of the writings which form what we call the "Old Testament" was very common, and formed a cherished treasure in every household. From the first book of the Maccabees, chapter i., v. 59 and 60, it appears that during the great persecution which preceded their rising up in arms against the tyranny which oppressed their country, one of the obnoxious edicts of king Antiochus was, that the houses should be searched, the sacred books found in them seized and destroyed, and that "every man in whose possession a book of the testament of the Lord was found" should be put to death.

It might have been interesting for the attentive listeners of Uncle Midas to hear from him these accounts, or others, no doubt presented in a better form,—and being taught that schools, and school-laws, and school-boards, and compulsory education, and academies and universities, were things well-known not only among the Jews, but among the Egyptians, before the days of the Exodus, when Moses was a student at Heliopolis; and that even newspapers, called Mikhtabhin, appear to have been in existence in the days of the childhood of our Lord, which were not allowed to appear on the Sabbath except when dwelling on public affairs.—("The Life, etc." Book ii., chap. 2.)

When Uncle Midas has gone through with his critical analysis of the "Gospel of the Infancy," and returned the book to its place in his library, to be kept there as a standing monument of human foolishness, he makes his audience listen to those passages in the Gospels which refer to the subject which he was discussing. And as he specially dwelt upon the second chapter of St. Luke, beginning at the 39th verse, he had special delight, as it seems, in portraying, as vividly as he could, the trip from Nazareth to Jerusalem,

which ended by the incident of the losing of the child Jesus and His finding in the temple.

With what care Uncle Midas describes what he calls that "procession"! The Blessed Virgin riding on a donkey; by her, her Divine Son, our Lord, marching on foot; and close to them St. Joseph, also on foot; surrounded by James, Joseph, Simon and Jude, who he says were the sons of St. Joseph by a former marriage. Fortunately Uncle Midas, who has a great respect for the Blessed Virgin, to such an extent as to compel him to ask pardon for it in consideration of his "great love of good women," did not do as others have done, rashly and impiously, and refrained from stating that the four personages above named were brethren of our Lord in the real, material sense of the word.

That James, Joseph, Simon and Jude were not the sons of St. Joseph, and not brothers, but cousins, of our Lord, the sons of Cleophas, also called Alpheus, and of Mary, a cousin of the Blessed Virgin, is a fact so well established, even simply historically, that Uncle Midas might have done better by talking to his listeners with more accuracy. Even Protestant writers of the most bigoted disposition, upon exhaustive inquiries, have had to recognize the true relationship of the four personages above named with our Divine Redeemer; and Puss, and Nan, and John, and the others who eagerly received the words of Uncle Midas might have been much better taught, and perhaps more pleased also, if, instead of the wrong notions put by him in their heads, they would have been given a short and interesting account of the family of both St. Joseph and the Blessed Virgin, and an explanation of who were the different persons named Mary whom the Gospels mention.

This very same trip to Jerusalem, which the commandments of the law caused the Holy Family, as well as all other faithful religious observers, to make, might have been under a different, and no doubt better, spirit, extremely interesting to the children who had gathered around the speaker. St. Epiphanius and St. Bernard, cited by Orsini in his "Life of the Blessed Virgin," chapter xv., informs us that in those journeys, both going and returning, the men went in companies, separate from the women, and that St. Joseph and the Blessed Virgin were in different companies, this having been the reason why neither of them felt at first uneasy at the disappearance of Jesus, and did not perceive it until the evening, when all the travelers assembled together. Instead of giving his listeners a description of the flight into Egypt, such as a great painter has portrayed it on canvas, the Blessed Virgin riding on a donkey and St. Joseph walking by her, Uncle Midas might have copied from Orsini, and given to his listeners

an account of the groups or companies of which the travelers formed a part during the day. "Around the Virgin," he says, "were Mary of Cleophas, sister-in-law of Joseph, another Mary, designated in the Gospel by the name of *altera Maria*, Salome, the wife of Zebedee, who came from Bethsaida, . . . Johanna, the wife of Chus, and a number of Nazarenes of her family connections and neighborhood. Joseph followed them at some distance, conversing gravely with Zebedee the fisherman and the ancients of his tribe. Jesus walked amidst some young Galileans whom the Gospel, according to the genius of the Hebrew tongue, has called his brethren, and who were his near relatives."

When the passage was reached relative to the answer which our Lord gave to His mother, "how is it that ye sought Me? Did you not know that I must be about the things that are My Father's?" or "about My Father's business," as Uncle Midas's Protestant New Testament read, one of the children asked what was meant by that phrase. Uncle Midas gravely answered by giving his listeners a lesson of religious indifference, if not real irreligion. "One of the clearest observations of my life," he said, "is that people of good intent are never troubled in the matter of religion, except as they stray off into that field. In return for your trust in me, take a rule of conduct, good for every day's observance: when you hear a man talking oracularly in definition of topics which our Lord thought best to leave outside of His teachings and revelation, set it down that he is trenching on the business of the Father and the prerogatives of the Son. Then go your way and let him alone."

In other words, whenever the successors of the Apostles, whenever the Church which has, and has to have, infallible authority to teach the truth, oracularly, as Uncle Midas says, in matters of religion, proclaim a tenet, or define a topic, or fix a dogma, set it down that the one and the other are intruders in the affairs of the Father. Close your ears to their teachings, turn your backs to them, and follow your own judgment.

All missions and apostolic work are no more than intrusions. No man *of good intent* can be troubled by these matters.

If this is all that Uncle Midas learned in this world, after his sixty-five years of experience as a lawyer, a soldier, an author, a traveler, a scholar, a statesman, and a diplomatist, he was certainly to be pitied.

PROTESTANTISM AND ART.¹

DESCRIBING the effects of the "Reformation" on art is analogous to describing the effects of the great eruption of Vesuvius on Pompeii, Herculaneum, and the surrounding country. When the blinding tempest has spent itself and the Stygian flood has congealed, nothing is visible under the sun but desolation and the blackness of fire-wrought ruin. The gardens and groves, the villas and vineyards that adorned the slopes of the mountain, and the fair Greek cities lower down are buried and blotted out. The Iconoclasts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries wrought similar havoc on the religious institutions and edifices and all they contained. To make the causes of the great catastrophe clear, it is necessary to go back to an earlier date.

The inventions and discoveries of the fifteenth century were instrumental in producing changes that no prophet predicted nor philosopher divined. They contributed to bring about revolutions and counter-revolutions, both in the objective and subjective worlds—in commerce, industry, art, science, and religion. Gunpowder had been invented and was rapidly revolutionizing the art of war. The invention of the mariner's compass and the astrolabe were revolutionizing the art of navigation. The great ocean navigators now sailed out free and far into the unknown, and discovered new worlds. The story told by Columbus on his return to Spain was charged with the magic of romance as well as the magic of science, and lifted men above the clouds. The volume of secular revelation continued to increase. The open book in the hand of the angel who had his right foot on the sea and his left foot on the land was read and devoured, for the fullness of time had come. The doubling of the Cape of Good Hope, the circumnavigation of the globe, the conquest of Mexico and Peru, were the inevitable sequel of the heroic exploits of Columbus. The discovery of Labrador by the Cabots and the St. Lawrence by Jacques Cartier, which brought England and France within the charmed circle of maritime exploration and colonial enterprise, fanned the spirit of adventure into swift activity and further extended the boundaries of knowledge. Geography, ethnography, and natural history suddenly expanded towards their natural limits, sweeping away many of the fables perpetuated or invented by Herodotus, Pliny, Marco Polo, and other historic celebrities. The invention of printing

¹ See CATHOLIC QUARTERLY for July, 1888, article "Art and Religion."

with movable types and the kindred art of engraving, or printing copies innumerable in black and white of drawings of every kind—representations of all objects—and the making of paper from linen rags, which, all three taken together in the printed and illustrated page, constitute the least perishable repository of ideas and the most potent of instrumentalities for acting on public opinion, were also products of this same wonder-breeding epoch.

The fall of Constantinople in the middle of the fifteenth century, which was immediately preceded and followed by an exodus of Greek scholars and artists, was another factor in the making of the modern world, for it gave a new and mighty impulse to the Renaissance—a movement which soon evinced a spirit of hostility to ethical Christianity. The promulgation of the Pythagorean or Copernican theory of the solar system capped the climax of the scientific movement and plumed speculative thought with daring pinion. When the pillared earth on which the sky rested became a whirling globe in the void, and in company with the peerless evening star and the other planets, and attended by the moon (unjustly called inconstant), revolving around the sun, who, clad in the majesty and terror of fire, sate enthroned in sovereign state on his own immovable centre, big-eyed wonder looked out transfixed on the fathomless mysteries of the transformed universe. The starry roof, more shadowy and unreal than a summer cloud, was dissolved and the old cosmogony vanished into space. The crystal sphere, inlaid with patens of fine gold, was resolved into incoherent innumerable units scattered through immeasurable space. All these stupendous novelties disturbed profoundly the equilibrium of the human faculties, and in the resulting reel and dizziness the foundations of the Church and of the world itself seemed to quake and fail. Imagination ran into fantasy and fantasy into magic and wild superstitions; there was white magic, and black magic, and a whole brood of diabolical delusions which owed their origin, it is believed, to the corrupt esoteric teachings of the Saracen schools in the Orient and in Spain, and which, perhaps, might be traced back to Egyptian priests and Chaldean seers in far-off times. Astrology and alchemy, phantasms of Arabian Sabianism, flourished more than at any previous period. Man's life was inexorably governed by the planets and constellations. The philosopher's stone and the elixir of life—gold and immortality—were the desiderata of pretended occult science. So-called sages and scholars searched with feverish haste for these talismans, and in the search wasted the fortunes of their disciples and dupes, and often their own lives, for they were not all impostors. Other noxious emanations from the nether world darkened the face of nature at this juncture, the most sinister and deadly of which was

witchcraft—a superstition which drank the blood of the classes that called especially for charity and protection—the old, the feeble, and the poverty-stricken.

Such was the intellectual condition of Europe at the advent of the “Reformation,” and those were the auxiliary causes of its rapid progress. Nothing was too gross for the credulity of the vulgar, provided it was a new thing. The age had drunk deeply of the Renaissance and of the new geographical and cosmical revelations. When the more potent chalice of the new theology was commended to the lips of the new generation, men drank so greedily of that chalice that many became mad—mad with that form of insanity which is contagious and which may seize a whole people of a sudden—Fanaticism.

Those movements and events down to the “Reformation” had no injurious effect on any branch of art, with one exception—miniature painting. The copying of manuscript was, of course, superseded by printing, and the art of illumination by engraving. This last was soon recognized as a legitimate form of fine art, and evidently destined to fulfil in a measure the same office for painting, sculpture, and architecture that the art of printing fulfils for letters, and, apart from that, to enter on a field exclusively its own, etching from nature—a field of which it is in full possession at present. Indeed, art steadily advanced, with the exception mentioned, till the throes of the Lutheran revolt began to shake Europe. As Beatrice grew more radiant and divine as she ascended from orb to orb, so art grew more beautiful and sublime in her gorgeous progress from decade to decade, till the great eclipse of faith in the sixteenth century “disastrous twilight shed on half the nations.” In that ghastly gloaming the spell-struck fanatic saw demons ambushed in shrine and image. Things of beauty, especially if associated with religion, instead of filling him with lofty joy, made day and night hideous to his haggard eye and perverted conscience. His zeal against idolatry became a fire and flame within him, to which the torch in the outer world soon responded.

The fall of Constantinople and the extinction of the Eastern Empire had extended the field of art in western Europe. The study and imitation of the antique were no novelties in Italy, for they were followed there from an early day by the Pisani, Squarchione, and their schools; but the Greek refugees, under the auspices of the Medici and other princes, imparted a momentum to it which determined the character of the years that followed, of which memorable years it became the dominant influence and far-shining blazon. The luxuriant results soon became marvellously apparent in art as well as literature, while in the social life and politics of the princes and nobles the smiling promise of the new spirit

soon passed into a sinister frown or a satyr-like leer—true forecasts of the lives they were doomed to lead. No doubt all this was inimical to asceticism and the temper of the cloister, and, indirectly, to Christian art, which had no longer the field exclusively to itself, but it added immensely to the repertoire of the studios. The old sculptures dug up from time to time furnished models of perfect physical form. The ample roll of mythology furnished themes for the decoration of palaces, municipal buildings, and banqueting halls. The artists, working in the new field, but still cultivating the old and greater one, acquired an amplitude of design and a freedom of fancy not permitted in sacred art. But as the pagan temples had yielded their stately columns and polished marbles to adorn the churches, so now another transition, from paganism to Christianity, but a wholly innocent and indeed edifying one, took place. The rhythmic proportions, rapt repose, and flowing lines of the Greek deities were bestowed on the saints and angels. However, this ennoblement of form was not permitted to mar the ancient Christian ideal or blur the divine sadness characteristic of the Christian types.

When it becomes necessary to tell once more what has been often told, the telling should be brief. Briefly, then, the years immediately preceding the "Reformation" were the golden age of Christian art. The fresh morning prime—the day of Giotto, of the Van Eycks, of the Pisani, of Memling, of Fra Angelico, of Verrocchio, of Massaccio, of the Bellini, of Perugino, of Martin Schongauer, passed in due season into the noontide splendor of Michael Angelo, Raphael, Titian, Leonardo, Giorgione, Francia, Albert Durer, Hans Holbein, Peter Vischer, and their hardly less famous brethren. These men were all born before the "Reformation," but all lived into it except Raphael, who died in 1520, the year Luther openly defied the Pope. Raphael and Luther were born the same year; Calvin and Michael Angelo died the same year. Melancthon, Zwingli, Henry the Eighth, Boccold, the Anabaptist, Karlstadt, the Saxon Iconoclast, Munzer, the leader of the German peasant insurrection, were all contemporaries, and also contemporaries of the great artists. John Knox was born in 1505 and John Calvin in 1509, but historically, if not strictly chronologically, they belonged to the same group as the English, German, and Swiss "Reformers." To borrow a phrase from the stage, they were all in the same cast, though some came on later than others.

At that critical, momentous period, when the earth trembled under the tread of giants, and those institutions of the Church which were overloaded with wealth and privilege were assailed by the secular powers that coveted that wealth and envied the privileges, art was still profoundly religious as well as supremely

grand. It continued to unfold its growing splendor in the churches, chapels, and oratories. By far the greater number of the works of the day—a day that was so soon to end—were designed for altars and shrines, or for the banners carried in religious processions, like the Madonna di San Sisto, or to illustrate dogma, like the Adoration of the Trinity, by Albert Durer, or the Disputa, by Raphael; or to illustrate the principal scenes in Holy Writ, like the frescoes in the Sistine Chapel. The subjects of all these *chefs d'œuvre*, and of all the *chefs d'œuvre* to be seen to-day in the museums, are taken from the supernatural, or, to say the least, the great majority of them. In the Disputa, for instance, heaven and earth, past and present, the quick and the dead, are embraced in one apocalyptic vision. Saint Thomas Aquinas and Dante, both of whom are there, seem to have given each a separate inspiration to Raphael. In short, whether we look to fresco painting, panel painting, or sculpture, we see once more, and nearly for the last time, the themes that were handled with timidity in the catacombs, and nobly developed in the basilicas, now invested with the highest attributes of beauty and power; but from the cubicula of St. Calixtus to the Arena Chapel, and thence to the Sistine, and from the Madonna in the Catacomb of Saint Priscilla (the earliest known picture of the Virgin and Child) to the Holbein and Raphael Madonnas in Dresden, first and last they are all conceived in the same spirit and fulfil the same ecclesiastical and devotional purpose, and for the fulfilment of which they were expressly designed and executed.

The greatest monument of pictorial representation the world has yet seen—the vault and the end wall of the Sistine Chapel—was created at this time. Let us dwell briefly on those gigantic achievements of Michael Angelo, as they illustrate vividly the transcendent excellence of art on the eve of the “Reformation.” In those immense frescoes there are three hundred and forty-five figures—most of them colossal—patriarchs, prophets, kings, sibyls, saints, angels, demons, Lucifer himself, and a greater than Lucifer. The series of compositions begins with the Creation and fitly ends with the Last Judgment. The Father Almighty, charioted on the wings of the cherubims by the wings of the wind, sweeping over the abyss, making the heavens and the earth, dominates the opening scene, and the Son of Man, with uplifted hand, gauntleted with wrath, the final and most fearful catastrophe. The Titanic forms in those vast compositions seem to have no affinity, except in shape, to beings of earthly mold, unless we go back to the antediluvian earth, before man lost his towering stature or his brow the brightness of the image in which he was made. To say that they excel all other pictorial works in that quality which is con-

fessedly the highest in every manifestation of art and nature,—sublimity,—is merely to repeat the unanimous verdict of the civilized world for four hundred years. They show the unexampled power of the hand as well as of the intellect and imagination of the author. The principal figures, except those in the *Inferno*, which are fitly clothed with hideousness and grizzly horror, are endowed in face and form with superhuman majesty and solemnity, as well as superhuman proportions. The muses in their flight evidently passed and paused there, and touched the mighty forms with the fire of life; and the heaven-eyed mystics, who, in those rapt moods when “thought was not,” passed the flaming bounds of space and time, touched them with a diviner ray brought down from a loftier sphere. The spirit in which the whole is conceived and executed reveals a double inspiration—the poetical and the religious; but that spirit is purely the supernatural spirit of the Middle Ages. While Michael Angelo’s architectural designs were inspired directly or indirectly by the monuments of ancient Rome, his paintings and sculptures, the truest expressions of his genius, and the most original, give ocular demonstration that they belong as wholly and truly to the mediæval cycle as the Gothic cathedrals beyond the Alps. Notwithstanding the authority to the contrary of a learned but bigoted historian (John Addington Symonds), we venture to say that no unprejudiced eye can discern in the works that cover the vast vault of the Sistine, or the vast space of the Last Judgment, any trace of the Humanist or pagan inspiration of the Renaissance, though the author in his youth was undoubtedly a protegee of Lorenzo de’ Medici, and a pupil of some of the Humanist scholars patronized by that prince. It is not too much to say that the glorious chapel of the Vatican enshrines the supreme epic of Christian art since Dante, and that its place is by the side of the “*Divina Commedia*,” of which it is a translation into visible form; but years before the work was finished, that is, before the Last Judgment was painted, the Iconoclastic movement, armed with fire and sword, had swept over Europe, leaving desolation in its track.

The historians and critics all agree that the “Reformation” was hurtful to religious art, and one of the many causes of its decline, and this they say in brief and general terms. However, no competent author or other authority, as far as the writer knows, admits that it was anything more than one of the many causes of that decline, much less the sole one, and, least of all, not only of the decline of sacred art, but of all art, sacred and profane, except music and poetry.¹ This is what the writer purposes to show in the fol-

¹ Briefly, then, we find that the religious revolution, wherever it penetrated, destroyed at a blow the great function of religious art, whilst everywhere the diffusion of printing largely lessened its importance as a means of popular instruction. Mean-

lowing pages by drawing the curtain from one of the most widespread scenes of the drama of the "Reformation," the image-breaking episode, of which but a dim and distant reminiscence seems to exist even among the learned. But some mention of the doctrinal propagandism which preceded the overt acts of wanton demolition is necessary in order to give an idea of the deep-seated motive which prompted those acts, and the lasting effects of the war on images.

The cry of idolatry, as the synonym and substance of image worship, or prayers and meditations in the presence of statues and pictures representing Christ and the saints, had resounded through Europe in early ages, and had sufficient force then to split the empire and the Church. Like the simoon it came from the hot sands of the desert, but left behind it no permanent evil results, except in the Byzantine empire and the Mohammedan world.¹ The "Reformers" now raised the same cry, and a spell of preternatural power as in the olden time it proved to be. Neither the diffusion of letters, the discoveries of science, the increase of commerce, nor the general progress in civilization had weakened its malefic energy in the least. The pulpits of Wittenberg and Zurich (Calvin the supreme Iconoclast had not yet made his *debut* as "reformer") thundered against idolatry. All the maledictions uttered in the Old Testament against idol worship were now hurled against the Church. Those fierce pulpiteers—apostate priests—struck at all the dogmas and traditions which were the æsthetic motives, and, we may add, the deepest inspiration of Christian art. The Real Presence was denied. The sacraments were reduced to two or three. The invocation of saints and angels was foolishness. The worship of the Blessed Virgin was idolatry. Prayers for the dead were of no avail; for as the tree fell, it lay. There was no middle state. The saints above were inaccessible to the voice of prayer from below, and in any case powerless to help saint or sinner. There was no communion of the living and the dead. Thus the outlines of the supernatural world were blurred or blotted out, and clouds of negation spread between earth and heaven. Fasting and

while the literary Renaissance, at first by its revelation of the master-works of Greek and Roman literature, then by the renewed impulse which it gave to physical science in all its branches, created interest for men's minds, which were not only in some degree opposed to serious art, but always in competition with it.—(Professor Palgrave, Oxford, *Decline of Art*.)

¹ The crusade of the Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, seems to have bequeathed a fatal influence to all religious art wherever the Greek church prevails. Ingler's *Hand-Book of Italian Painting*, for instance, says of Russia: "Every exercise of individual power of genius is interdicted to the religious artists." The same thing is true of the painters of all the other states in the east which adhere to the Greek communion, while sculpture is unknown there.

abstinence, and especially the Lenten fasts, were of pagan origin and devoid of all merit. The higher life was scoffed at as a fanatical delusion or a cloak for the grossest sensuality. The monastic vows of poverty, chastity and humility, and the solemn covenants between the priest and the Holy Trinity were vain formulæ, of which the recording angel or the enlightened conscience took no cognizance. The Mass was a most impious and damnable incantation, the foulest of idolatrous abominations. In brief, superstition and idolatry were the warp and woof of the old religion, which was no religion at all, but the great apostacy predicted by the prophet, and the Pope was ANTI-CHRIST, the MAN of SIN, the SON of PERDITION. To sum up, the brightest stars of the Catholic firmament were wrested from their orbits, as it were, and quenched as quickly as meteors.

The "Reformers," still growing more and more radical, called trumpet-tongued for the extirpation of the whole system and the "purging" of the houses of worship. Wherever this fierce and virulent polemic gained ground, the first effects of it were to dry up the spiritual fountains and abrogate the practical conditions essential to the growth and nourishment of sacred art. The second effect was to let loose a tempest of Iconoclastic fury on the art works in the cathedrals, convents, and other ecclesiastical buildings in northern and western Europe. Saint and angel were banished from shrine and sanctuary, even where shrine and sanctuary were not yet razed to the ground. The altar was not only stripped, but wrenched from its pride of place, and degraded into a common table. The command went forth, "Since pictures and statues are idols and instruments of Satan, let them be all destroyed." The work of destruction once begun raged like a conflagration. Glass is fragile. The painted windows, one of the chief glories of Gothic architecture, were the first to fall. Tabernacles, choir stalls, episcopal chairs, organs, missals, and pictures were heaped into bonfires; statues of saints and angels, prophets and apostles, and the recumbent effigies of knights and nobles and their dames, were hammered in pieces and burned into lime. Heroic monumental art, of which there was a great deal in the crypts and the parts of the upper churches appropriated to tombs, fared no better than religious art. In many places nothing escaped, in others just enough of fragments and mutilated figures to indicate the magnitude of the disaster. The artistic product of several centuries, garnered in the sacred houses, the gifts and bequests and sepulchral monuments of pious and heroic generations, from whose loins the destroyers themselves were sprung, were all swept away by the torrent of puritanical fanaticism. Apart from the deluge of blood that inundated Europe, and the manifold suf-

ferings of the inhabitants caused by the more than hundred years of fighting between Catholics and Protestants that followed the "Reformation," there is no incident in modern history more to be regretted than this, because it robbed posterity of an inheritance invaluable in itself, and which was also a powerful aid to letters and chivalry in the extension of liberal culture. The loss was irremediable, because the spirit which had created mediæval art had fled the earth, though, happily, it sent down the new music in the person of Palestrina as a paraclete to a forsaken world.¹

The severity of this indictment calls for a specific account of the wreck and ruin perpetrated by the Iconoclasts, to show that we have attempted no exaggeration; and if the sombre outlines sketched above shall be filled in with more sombre strokes and darker colors, it is because the brush is wielded by history itself. The testimony bearing on the case is voluminous; but only Protestant authorities of recognized rank shall be quoted, and but a few, because the facts have never been disputed. This polemic, if polemic it be, is confined to the action and influence, immediate and remote, of the "Reformation" on the arts of design. Music and poetry are not within its scope, much less the graver questions of politics and social science, though one or other may incidentally intrude for a moment. The "Reformation" was not only a revolution, but the fruitful mother of revolutions; and the end is not yet. Many a laureate has sung her stormy, blood-red glories in burning phrase, and many an eloquent expositor identified her among crowding causes as the gracious mistress of modern civilization, and apostrophized her as the supreme benefactress of the human race, and her iron-tongued apostle as the grandest incarnation of heroism. The literature containing those panegyrics in prose and verse fills libraries, and he who runs may read. Those multitudinous, many-voiced laudations are not challenged here because the purpose is to keep strictly within self-prescribed limits, and as far away as possible from the arena of dogmatic controversy. Nevertheless, the question this article is attempting to elucidate, which is but a branch of a greater subject—a subject which without exaggeration may be said to reach from earth to heaven and from time to eternity—is perhaps fraught with meaning and teaching of

¹ "The peace of Westphalia, concluded in 1648, is important, however, not as marked in the introduction of new principles, but as winding up the struggle which had convulsed Germany since the revolt of Luther, sealing its results and closing definitely the period of the Reformation."—Brice, *Holy Roman Empire*, Chapter 19.

That period closed in England with the battle of Worcester, fought in 1651, and in France with the accession of Henri Quatre, although the Huguenots were in rebellion several times subsequently. The wars of the "Reformation" began in 1524, with the insurrection of the German peasants and the Anabaptist outbreak. They lasted for a century and a quarter.

vital import. The new age looking before and after and pondering the everlasting problem of man's destiny is coming, if we mistake not, to the belief that beauty and sublimity in art, and beauty and sublimity in human character, are of kindred origin, and that the religion which produces the best, and the most of the best, both in art and life, has credentials which the Sadducee, and even the atheist, must recognize. The true, the beautiful, and the good, the virtues and the graces, are all fruit from the same tree—the tree of life, which bears, we are told, twelve kinds of fruit, and the leaves of which are for the healing of the nations.

At the "Reformation" all Europe abounded in magnificent cathedrals, abbeys, priories, and churches. They were immense piles, the growth or aggregation of centuries, and were thronged with shrines and altars, very many of which were dowered with all the treasures that wealth and genius, stimulated by piety or contrition, could bestow. But no religious edifice, however small or remote, was destitute of pictures, banners, vestments, chalices, candlesticks, illuminated missals, and other requisites of the altar. These, it may be presumed, were of varying artistic quality, and some of them doubtless of no artistic quality at all; but however rude some of them might be, they were all hallowed by the association consequent on long usage. They served to instruct and edify the laity generation after generation. In short, the art treasures of the Church when the "Reformation" broke out were numberless, and unfortunately her other possessions and the *personnel* of her establishments were on a corresponding scale.

England, which is nearest to us morally, intellectually, and otherwise, first claims our notice. There, according to the historian, the "Reformation" was carried out more gradually and more mildly, less thoroughly, in fact, than in any other country. "Of all European churches," says Hume, "which shook off the yoke of the Papal authority, no one proceeded with so much reason and moderation as the Church of England." Notwithstanding this, we look in vain for reason or moderation in the treatment bestowed by the English Iconoclasts on the art possessions of the Church. On the contrary, we see nothing in their conduct but unreason, violence, and destructiveness. To begin with, Henry the Eighth (according to the historian already mentioned), "at different times suppressed six hundred and forty-five monasteries, ninety colleges, two thousand three hundred and seventy-four churches and free chapels, and one hundred and ten hospitals." The suppression of all these houses necessarily involved the destruction or dispersion of their artistic collections. This of itself would account for the decline of the artistic faculty and the scarcity of mediæval art work in that country, but worse followed. Throughout England,

says Froude, "by the year 1539 there was nothing left to tell of the presence of the saints but the names that clung to the churches they had built, or the shadowy memories which hung about their desecrated tombs. . . . Still the torrent rolled onward, monasteries and images were gone, and fancy relics in endless number. There remained the peculiar treasures of the great abbeys and cathedrals. . . . The bodies of the saints had been gathered into costly shrines which a beautiful piety had decorated with choicest offerings." Needless to add, the shrines were plundered and demolished. Not one was left in existence. It is true, St. Edward the Confessor's is still to be seen in Westminster Abbey; but it is not the original structure, but a restoration from the old building materials some considerable time after the walls were pulled down.¹

With the advent of the young Edward, and the rule of Protector Somerset, a new and hungrier brood of zealots appeared on the stage, ravening for the last remnants of the possessions of the Church. There was little left—the fragments of what the first comers were unable to devour—but yet enough to whet the appetite for spoils, and inflame the mania of image breaking. We quote again from Froude: "Injunctions were issued for the general purification of the churches. From wall and window, every picture, every image commemorative of saint, or prophet, or apostle was to be extirpated and put away so that there should remain no memory of the same. Painted glass survives to show that the order was imperfectly obeyed; but in general, spoliation became the law of the land—the statues crashed from the niches; rood and rood-loft were laid low, and the sunlight stared on the whitened aisles. . . .

"The cathedrals and the churches of London became the chosen scenes of riot and profanity. St. Paul's was the stock exchange of the day, where the merchants of the city met for business, and the lounge where young gallants gathered, fought, and killed each other. They rode their horses through the aisles and stabled them among the monuments. . . .

"As to the mass of the people, hospitals were gone, schools broken up, almshouses swept away; every institution which Catholic piety had bequeathed for the support of the poor was either abolished or suspended; and the poor themselves, smarting with rage and suffer-

¹ The account of the pillage and demolition of the shrine of St. Thomas in Canterbury Cathedral—the richest shrine in the world—is a very curious page of "Reformation" history. The saint, who had been dead for centuries, was cited to appear in court in London and be tried for treason. Not obeying the summons, he was condemned in his absence as a traitor, upon which the king "ordered his name to be struck out of the calendar, the office of his festival to be expunged from all breviaries, his bones to be burned and the ashes to be thrown in the air."

ing and seeing piety, honesty, duty, trampled under foot by their superiors, were sinking into savages. . . . Missals were chopped in pieces with hatchets, college libraries plundered and burned. The divinity schools were planted with cabbages and the Oxford laundresses dried clothes in the schools of arts.”—(Froude’s “History of England,” vol. v. chapter 77.)

Knowing that the England of to-day is not an artistic country, the Philistine and the cynic may be skeptical as to the value and number of the works destroyed, and also, perhaps, as to the excellence of all art of the mediæval period, or even disposed to sit in the seat of the scorner, like Carlyle—true in this one thing to the teaching of John Knox—and sneer at the fine arts one and all, and of all climes and times. But the Gothic cathedrals, steeped in pensive beauty, and breathing, though faintly now, the odors of ancient sanctity, still stand to shame the scorner and confound the ignorant. These majestic fabrics testify in no doubtful way to the unsurpassed splendor of the artistic genius of the English as well as their profound piety, before the “Reformation”; but on this head we are not left to mere deduction, as witness the following from a late work by a learned divine of the English church:¹

“Now up and down this land of England there are, say, five thousand churches that at this moment stand upon the same foundations that they stood upon five hundred years ago; some few of them standing in the main as they were left eight centuries ago. If for five thousand any one should suggest, not five thousand, but ten thousand, I should find no fault with the correction.

“If we go back in imagination to the condition of these churches as they were left when the Reformation began, it may safely be affirmed that there was not at that time, there never had been, and there is never likely to be again, anything in the world that could at all compare with our English churches. There never has been an area of anything like equal extent so immeasurably rich in works of art such as were then to be found

¹ We find the following in Lubke’s *History of Sculpture*: “In England, where historical and political feeling are so highly developed, we should expect above all a monumental art. But just as little as the English have taste or talent for higher historical painting, have they been able to develop an important plastic art. There is no lack of monuments of their great men; but they are throughout so unsuccessful, so devoid of style, yet at the same time so completely without any vigorous conception of nature, that we are inclined to doubt if they possess any higher plastic talent.” But this is mild in comparison with the utterances of Leighton (Sir Frederick), Alma Tadema, and other shining lights of the artistic world at the convention of “Arts and Crafts” held in London last November. The speakers, all artists of more or less distinction, asserted and deplored the insensibility—the deadness—of the English people as a whole to every form of art, and their incapacity to discriminate between good and bad art.

within the four seas. The prodigious and incalculable wealth stored up in the churches of this country in the shape of sculpture, glass, needlework, sepulchral monuments in marble, alabaster, and metal—the jewelled shrines, the precious MSS.—their bindings, the frescoes and carved work, the vestments and exquisite vessels in silver and gold, and all the quaint and dainty and splendid productions of an exuberant artistic appetite, and an artistic passion for display, which were to be found not only in the great religious houses, but dispersed more or less in every parish church in England, constituted such an enormous aggregate of precious forms of beauty as fairly baffles the imagination when we attempt to conceive it. There are lists of the *church goods*, i.e., of the contents of churches, by the thousands, not only in the sixteenth century, but in the fourteenth; there they are for any one to read; and, considering the smallness of the area and the poverty of the people, I say again that the history of the world has nothing to show which can for one moment be compared with our English churches as they were to be found when the spoilers were let loose upon them. Well! We all know that a clean sweep was made of the *contents* of these churches. The locusts devoured all. But the *fabrics* remained—the fabrics have remained down to our time—they are, as it were, the glorious framework of the religious life of the past.”¹

It remains to be added that further demolition of fane and sacred symbol marked the triumphant progress of the Calvinists during the great rebellion. The sword of the Puritan was edged with as keen a fanaticism as the scymitar of the Mussulman. The Long Parliament, when it relaxed from the more serious business of massacreing the Irish and murdering witches, seems to have given the last touch to the work of the Iconoclasts.² Assuming regal power, it issued orders for the demolishing of all images, altars and crucifixes, which act would imply that some relics of the old religion still survived. They had been hidden, perhaps, or escaped because they were in out-of-the-way places. “The zealous Sir Robert Harley,” says Hume (to whom the execution of these orders was committed), “removed all crosses even out of street and market, and from his abhorrence of that superstitious figure, would not anywhere allow one piece of wood or stone to lie over another at right angles.” The Root and Branch men

¹ “The Coming of the Friars, and other historic essays,” by the Rev. Augustus Jessop, D.D., 1889.

² The era of the Long Parliament was that, perhaps, which witnessed the greatest number of executions for witchcraft. Three thousand persons are said to have perished during the continuance of the sittings of that body by legal execution, independently of summary deaths at the hands of the mob.—*Chambers's Encyclopædia*.

were now riding the whirlwind and guiding the storm. Canterbury and other cathedrals were further purged by acts of Parliament. Litchfield had undergone a siege and bombardment; Lincoln escaped, though the bishop's palace was burned down. Westminster, which had suffered least of any, because the two cities, London and Westminster, had always adhered to the Parliamentary cause, was only turned into a barrack where the soldiers contented themselves by breaking up the organ, dining regularly on the communion table and, dressed in surplices, playing hounds and hare in the aisles.

In passing from England to the Continent, we find the "Reformation" growing more radical in doctrine and more destructive in deed. The destroyers were now infuriated mobs. Luther himself was, perhaps, the most conservative, although the most vituperative of all the "Reformers," and no Iconoclast. He looked on the sacred figures in the churches with an indifferent, not a hostile, eye, and he was devoted to music and hymnody—a quality in him which has borne fruit in all the Lutheran countries—but the movement which he led was instinct with Iconoclasm from the beginning, and in that direction quickly passed beyond his control. During his seclusion in Wartburg, one of his disciples, Karlstadt, inflamed the common people in Saxony by his denunciation of idolatry. The usual consequences followed. Frenzied crowds broke into the churches and destroyed the works of art. Luther, on learning this, hastened from his retreat, where he had been lying *perdu*, and, by the exercise of his authority and the eloquence of his rebukes, put a stop to Karlstadt's crusade and suppressed, for a time, the fanaticism of his followers. The Anabaptist, Munzer, took up the torch which Karlstadt had let fall, and set several of the German states, including all upper Germany, aflame with his wild doctrines and rabid exhortations. The peasant insurrection, which he instituted and led, was the blackest episode in the history of the Protestant movement of that country; and church wrecking and idol smashing were the least of the outrages perpetrated by the fanatics.¹ When the insurrection was suppressed and Munzer beheaded, many of his followers took refuge in the Low Countries and Westphalia, where they continued to propagate their political and religious notions. Two of their prophets, one from Haarlem and one from Leyden, settled in the imperial city of Münster, where these zealots made many converts. The sect attempted more than once to get possession of the place; but at last, calling in secretly their brethren from Holland, they arose at night in

¹ No such insurrection, so widespread, so sanguinary, and so ruthless in its vengeance had ever before disquieted Germany as that which marked the close of the year 1524.—*Encyclopædia Britannica*.

great tumult, seized the public buildings, created a panic among the people, who fled in terror before the frantic multitude of strangers that howled as they charged through the streets, and who took the sleeping citizens as much by surprise as the Greeks did the sleeping Trojans. The inevitable result followed. The contents of all the churches in Münster and the surrounding country were speedily reduced to ashes, and after a while the churches themselves devoted to destruction, because Boccold, the prophet and leader, prophesied that whatever was highest on earth should be brought low, and the churches were the loftiest buildings of the city! Somehow they escaped, notwithstanding.

In the Netherlands, or Holland, as we say now, where not a few of the followers of Munzer took refuge, the most radical Calvinistic doctrines prevailed, and consequently the frenzy of image-breaking fiercely raged. Between the "Reformation" and the wars that grew out of the "Reformation" in that country, all pre-"Reformation" art was well-nigh swept away. There was an endless store of it, for the Dutch were a gifted people in the ages of faith. But almost all perished. "We shall never," says a learned contemporary writer, "indeed, possess more than scraps and fragments of information about the earliest Dutch painters, those of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, for their works and their very names perished in the frightful and disastrous confusion of the Reformation, the religious wars and the struggle with Spain."¹ It is impossible, the writer goes on to say, to do more than guess what the world lost by the Iconoclastic movement in Holland in the sixteenth century. A common oblivion seems to have swallowed up the names of the artists and their productions as well as the names of the incendiaries who made a *tabula rasa* of the country as far as the Church was concerned. To this a single observation may be added: The sculptors and their works shared the fate of the painters and their works. Lubke, in his "History of Sculpture," fails to mention a single marble or bronze, a carved or molten image, in all Holland, or the name of a Dutch sculptor of the fifteenth or sixteenth century.

What happened in that part of the Netherlands we now call Belgium is described by Motley in one of his most eloquent passages.² We extract some sentences, but the whole chapter should be read:

"The Netherlands possessed an extraordinary number of churches and monasteries. Their exquisite architecture and elaborate decoration had been the earliest indication of intellectual culture displayed in the country. . . .

¹ *Les chefs d'œuvre du Musée Royal d'Amsterdam*, par A. Bredius, Traduction Française, par Emile Michel.

² *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, vol. i., chap. 7. Motley, though he depicts in vivid colors the destruction, does his best to excuse the authors of it.

"All that science could invent, all that art could embody, all that mechanical ingenuity could dare, all that wealth could lavish—all gathered round these magnificent temples. . . .

" . . . Many were filled with paintings from a school which had precedence in time and merit over its sister nurseries of art in Germany. All were peopled with statues. All were filled with profusely adorned chapels. . . .

" . . . And now, for the space of only six or seven days and nights, there raged a storm by which all these treasures were destroyed. Nearly every one of these temples was rifled of its contents. Art must forever weep over this bereavement. . . .

"The mob rose in the night in Antwerp and began by wrecking the great cathedral church of Our Lady, and before morning they had sacked thirty churches within the walls. . . .

"A troop of harlots, snatching waxen tapers from the altars, stood around the destroyers and lighted them at their work. . . .

"They destroyed seventy chapels, forced open all the chests of treasure, covered their own squalid attire with the gorgeous robes of the ecclesiastics, and burned the splendid missals and manuscripts.

" . . . A colossal and magnificent group of the Saviour crucified between two thieves adorned the principal altar. The statue of Christ was wrenched from its principal place . . . while the malefactors, with bitter and blasphemous irony, were left on high."

The havoc, as Motley calls it, began in Antwerp. The Calvinistic mob rose in the night and first gutted the great Cathedral—the Church of our Lady. Before morning they had sacked thirty churches within the walls. "Two days and nights longer the havoc raged unchecked through all the churches of Antwerp and the neighboring villages. Hardly a statue or picture escaped destruction. The number of churches desecrated has never been counted. In the single province of Flanders four hundred were sacked. . . . In an hour the convent of Marchiennes, the most beautiful abbey in Flanders, was laid in ruins. . . . Pictures, statues, organs, chalices of silver and gold, lamps, censers, vestments glowing with pearls, rubies, and precious stones, were destroyed or stolen." Similar scenes took place in Valenciennes, Tournay, and Ghent. Great, indeed, was the havoc, but the incendiaries were interrupted at Anchin, where they were attacked and dispersed. Limburg, Luxemburg, and Namur thus escaped the terrible visitation. Flanders was then, as it is to-day, a Catholic country at bottom; and this explains why many glorious specimens of early Flemish art may still be seen, some there, but many more in foreign collections, whither they found their way to save them from the dangers which threatened them at home.¹

¹ One of Michael Angelo's noblest works, a statue of the Blessed Virgin, with the infant Saviour, is in the Cathedral at Bruges. The hospital there is adorned with exquisite religious paintings from the hand of Hans Memling. The famous work of the brothers Van Eyck, the Adoration of the Mystic Lamb, or the Agnes Dei, or at least the better part of the picture, is in St. Bavon's in Ghent. The Calvinists of that place wanted to give it to Queen Elizabeth.—(See *Early Flemish Painters*, Crowe and Cavalcasselle.)

The epidemic of image breaking fell on Switzerland in 1529, in which year the cantons that followed the teachings of Zwingli abolished altars, images and organs. In any case these were now superfluous, for religious service in the churches was reduced to extemporaneous prayers and extemporaneous sermons—both, it is hardly necessary to remark, of inordinate length. Woltmann and Woermann, in their "*History of Painting*," say: "Many of Holbein's religious paintings must have perished in the Iconoclastic mania which fell upon Basle in 1529, but those that remained sufficed to reveal his greatness."

Identical, or, correctly speaking, more lurid scenes were witnessed in France. There is, in fact, a dreary similitude, a servile imitativeness, in the acts of Iconoclasts of every age and clime. But the Huguenots are at least entitled to the palm for outdoing all others of their day. Whether because their hatred of idolatry came direct from a Frenchman, or because of the more inflammable nature of the Gaul, they wielded torch and sledge-hammer with more deadly effect than even the German Anabaptists, and on a much wider scale. From them came the spirit which possessed the "Reformation" in Holland and the doctrines which its apostles propagated there. "Wherever the Huguenots prevailed," says Hume, "the images were broken, the altars pillaged, the churches demolished, the monasteries consumed with fire." Later, the Jacobin followed the track of the Huguenot, destroying much of what had remained. Between them so little escaped that the German authorities quoted above open the seventh chapter of their "*History of Painting*" with the statement: "How much or how little of the real genius of the French nation was expressed by her early painters it is hard to tell, for the storms of revolution dealt more disastrously with the ancient art in France than in almost any other land."

In Scotland the campaign was appropriately initiated by John Knox. In Perth one Sunday he preached a fierce sermon against the idolatry of the Mass which fired the rabble, who proceeded straightway to wreck the churches and monasteries of that city, and did wreck them before the dawn of the second day. From Perth the wild contagion spread. The "Congregation" took up the word, and in a short time masses of blackened ruins marked the sites of the cathedrals and monastic houses. Even the great abbey of Scone, where the kings of Scotland were crowned from time immemorial, was laid in ashes. The holy places, of which there were many, were defiled. The native incendiaries escaped the parricidal guilt of demolishing Melrose, because it had already been burned down by the English. Its lofty, though broken, arches and massive walls will long perpetuate the memory of that

insensate sacrilege. The historical student may well think that one place at least would have been spared—Iona—the primitive seat of learning and civilization, founded a thousand years before by St. Columbkille and his associate monks from Ireland, to whom Scotland is indebted, not only for her very name, but for all that makes her early history worth perusing. But Iona shared the fate of all other monastic establishments. The ruthless and rapacious nobles, headed by Argyll, were worse than the city mobs, for the latter were impelled by blind fanaticism, while greed, and revenge springing from hereditary feuds, were the inspiring motives of the former. No feeling of nationality, no reverence for antiquity, served to protect those noble monuments, consecrated though they were by saintly and heroic names and traditions, going back to the very limit of historic time. In compensation for all that, the Scotchman can now behold the huge form of John Knox on his pillar, towering spectre-like in the grimy atmosphere of Glasgow, and darkly overshadowing the whole mount of the Necropolis.¹ The rapidity and thoroughness with which the Scotch "Reformers" performed their *Godly* task is well summed up in three lines by a great poet, who sometimes, as in this instance, falls into puerility and bathos. Wordsworth, in the "Excursion," calls them

"Godly men, who swept from Scotland, in a flame of zeal,
Shrine, altar, image and the massy piles
That harbored them."

Nor was the Iconoclastic movement limited to what may be called Protestant territory, or territory partly Catholic and partly Protestant. Catholic countries, too, felt its force. In this, as in so many other things, Ireland was a hapless victim. The invader it was that fired her temples, as the Persians fired those of Greece, and the Moslems those of Eastern Christendom. It is true that when Henry the Eighth suppressed the monasteries he found the Irish chieftains just as greedy for spoils as the Anglo-Norman barons. In fact, he enlisted the concurrence, or at least the acquiescence, of both classes in the enterprise, by giving them rich gifts

¹ The Glasgow Presbyterians are no longer prejudiced against images. In November, 1877, after visiting the cathedral, a Gothic church of the olden time, justly celebrated, the writer directed his steps towards another church in the vicinity which he took to be a Catholic church, because marble statues of heroic size of the twelve Apostles, St. Peter with his keys and St. Paul with his sword at the head of them, stood on the roof. On coming up to the church he discovered that it was a church of the United Presbyterians.

Dr. Talmage, in a sermon delivered on the 28th of October, took the "Divine Mission of Pictures" as his subject, and spoke eloquently of the spirit of Pope Gregory the Second's letter to the Iconoclastic emperor, Leo the Isaurian, on the salutary uses of sacred pictures.

out of the confiscated lands. The result, of course, was the decay and ruin of the abbeys and kindred edifices. The churches and cathedrals lived to a later day, but many of them were demolished during the Elizabethan and Cromwellian wars. The few that survive were taken from their owners and handed over to Protestants, who hold them to this day. Altered as they were to suit the new form of worship, they are but the skeletons of their former selves; but they are indebted for their preservation, so far as they have been preserved, to the change of ownership. These and a number of the round towers are the only ecclesiastical structures that have escaped the all but universal wreck; and of the latter only a few are found in their original condition. Ireland, however, is studded with magnificent ruins, not a few of which, like Cormac's Chapel on the rock of Cashel, antedate the coming of Strongbow and Henry the Second, and these, taken in connection with the round towers and the groups of small stone-roofed churches still extant, though in ruins, prove that the island had an architecture of her own, which was as purely original as her matchless metal work, her illuminated manuscripts and sculptured crosses. All the way from Derry to Donegal, from Mayo to Armagh, from Clare to Wicklow, are found the remains of abbeys, friaries, priories, and churches, some of which, like those on the rock of Cashel and in Cong and Sligo and Kilmallock (ancient capital of the Desmonds), show exquisite architectural forms and rich sculptural ornamentation. The parish churches throughout the land were also demolished during the Cromwellian and subsequent priest-hunting times, and in their moss-covered stones the rising generation finds sermons little in accord with the peace of the forty generations who sleep in the surrounding churchyards. The ruins of castles and donjon towers may also be seen, and humbler but sadder ruins, which have no background of antiquity and are touched with no beauty. Coming to this, one is seized with the thought that descanting on architectural ruins in the presence of the moral ruins that cast their darker shadows over hill and valley, is irrelevant dilettantism and almost mockery. The conquerors laid the polity, the jurisprudence, the literature, the language, and the industries of the people in ruins. They stripped the Celt of all his worldly possessions. They created a void wherein for long intervals nothing is visible but the *disjecta membra* of a mutilated nationality. They attempted to lay Irish human nature itself in ruins by dooming the Catholic to perpetual poverty, serfdom, and ignorance. The Invincible, the Dynamiter, the Moonlighter, are Frankensteins fashioned by those veritable miscreators. With pleasure let it be admitted that for sixty years they have been trying with more or less expedition—chiefly less—to abate the entailed evils of the penal laws; and for

more than a decade to reform the cruel and corrupted feudal tenures which worked invariably for the expulsion or extermination of the tillers of the soil.

This brief survey will be fitly finished by turning for a moment to Rome. Far away as the Pontifical city is from Saxony and Switzerland, from Wittenburg and Zurich, she yet was scathed and wrecked by the terrible *tramontane* that swept down the whole length of the peninsula. Rome was the theatre of perhaps the most deplorable incident of the whole widespread campaign against religious art, because that city more abounded in works of high art than any other place. Its siege in 1527 by the troops of the Emperor Charles the Fifth, under the Constable de Bourbon, was followed by the most shocking outrages which a licentious soldiery can inflict on a defenceless community. Happily, any further allusion to these unmentionable things is not called for here. Suffice it to say that the troops pillaged church and palace indiscriminately, beginning with St. Peter's and the Vatican. After despoiling princes and prelates, bankers and merchants, of everything within sight or search, they put the victims of their robbery to the torture to extort confession of hidden treasure, and subsequently held them to heavy ransom. They threw into the same melting pot altar vessels from the days of Constantine and drinking cups fresh from the chisel of Benvenuto Cellini, for the metal was the one thing they were capable of appreciating. They made booty of the jewels, vestments, tapestries, laces, embroideries of the altars—in short, of all that allured their cupidity or excited their admiration. Nor did they stop there. The German-Lutheran contingents of the Imperial army, which were much the largest part of it, were filled with the same holy horror of images as their brethren in the North. To break or burn pictures or statues was a labor of love with them; and, accordingly, they proceeded to destroy altar-pieces and graven images wherever they found them, and they were easily found. They destroyed the painted windows of the Vatican designed by Raphael and executed by Gulielmo da Marsiglia, the greatest master of glass painting that has ever lived. They effaced several heads of Raphael's frescoes in the Stanze, and doubtless would have left Rome as bare as a sectarian conventicle, or the whitewashed interiors spoken of by Froude, if their occupation of the city had lasted much longer. They did more damage during their stay of two months than their ancestors, the Goths and Vandals, had done, from Alaric down.¹

¹ Les places devant toutes les églises étaient gonchées des ornements d'autel, des reliques, et de toutes les choses sacrées, que les soldats jetaient dans la rue, après en avoir arraché l'or et l'argent. Les luthériens allemands, joignant le fanatisme religieux à la cupidité, s'efforçaient de montrer leur mépris pour les pompes de l'église

It is unnecessary to pursue this quest. The same phenomena appeared whenever and wherever the "Reformation" prevailed, even temporarily. All Europe now became involved in what are called religious wars, complicated with dynastic struggles. The muses may glorify heroes and sing the fierce joys of battle before the war begins and also when it is over, but while the clash of arms is heard they are as silent as the laws which should protect the people. The wars that grew out of the "Reformation" failed to touch a single one of the sacred nine with any sentiment but mute sorrow. There is no epos of that long, protracted, weary struggle, nor is there any monumental record of it in pictorial, plastic, or architectural art. The era of church building naturally closed when the era of church burning began. There is one exception to this: Though the ark of the Church was buffeted by a fiercer storm of "felon winds" than any previously encountered, yet, as if to demonstrate that while she lives art will live, the lofty dome of St. Peter's arose at this time on the Vatican hill. If that peerless shrine has an expression and intellectual meaning that gives it a unique aspect, outside and inside, and that distinguishes it from all other architectural wonders, it is that of tranquil joy blended with Olympian grandeur, qualities which the exalted imagination immediately recognizes as meet attributes of the Church, no longer militant, but now and forever triumphant; no gloom or shadow, but the brightness of day in the vast spaces, lateral and longitudinal, of the interior, the intersection of which is marked by the tomb of the Apostles, which thrice sacred spot is overhung by that radiant dome, sky-born, verily descended from the orb'd Heaven, of which it is the symbol, and which brought down with it the airs of Heaven; everywhere and in everything that largeness of style, that breadth of effect, which nature has imparted to mountain forms and landscape distances seen from mountain heights; the whole lapped in the elysium of a climate of its own, the grateful temperature of which is the same in all seasons. Well might it have inspired the meteor bard of hostile creed and alien tongue with a hymn of praise worthy of the Hebrew Psalmist. Yet the hundred years it took to build was a hundred years of decadence, as the statues within and without testify; their inferiority to the architectural design, as well as their incongruity, is obvious.

romaine, et de profaner ce que respectaient les peuples qu'ils nommaient idolâtres. Cependant, après le premier jour de fureur, dans lequel ils auraient voulu égorger tous ceux qui avaient porté les armes, les Allemands ne tirèrent plus l'épée; ils l'adoucirent même tellement que leurs prisonniers purent le racheter d'eux après bon compte. Dès lors ils ne songèrent plus qu'à boire, à ramasser de l'argent, et à détruire les tableaux et les statues qui leur paraissaient des monuments d'idolâtrie.—(Sismondi, *Republiques Italiennes*.)

Of course, this does not apply to Michael Angelo's "Pieta," than which no group of sculpture in existence, not even the "Laocoon," is so full of ideal pathos.

Had the work of the sixteenth century Iconoclast been confined to the abolition of outward things, art would probably have risen bright and buoyant from her ashes. There is hardly one of the existing mediæval cathedrals that has not been wholly or partially destroyed by fire at one time or another; but down to a comparatively late date each new reconstruction was an improvement almost always on its predecessor, because the ideas and material conditions which prevailed when the original structures were founded lasted to the "Reformation," and art tradition was till then unbroken, while art herself continued to expand with the years. To tear down the golden branch, however heavily laden with fruit and flower, does not necessarily kill the tree, much less blight the whole academic grove:

"Primo avulso non deficit alter."

The innate powers that dwell in the penetrating roots and the lordly trunk suddenly sprout out again in another golden branch, having all the beauty and mystic virtue of that which it replaces. The golden age of Athenian art immediately succeeded the overthrow and expulsion of the Persian invaders, who had laid the temples of Greece in ashes, and left nothing visible on the summit of the Acropolis but a heap of ruins, a mountain on a mountain. Yet in a few short years the austere deity, who smote the impious hordes of barbarians with terror and the madness of terror, was able to look down again on her beloved city of the Triple Crown, now more glorious than before—luminous with the aureole of all Olympus—from the new and diviner temple in which she was enshrined. The ruins of the Parthenon, sculptural and architectural, still awaken divine emotion in Christian souls, idols and of the house of idols though they were. The temples now rose in greater splendor, and the great Homeric statue of Jupiter at Olympia, with that of Athene just alluded to, also colossal, both of ivory and gold, the masterpieces of Phidias and of all ancient plastic art, rose contemporaneously. Fire and sword may destroy works of art, but they are powerless to destroy art itself, which is an organic thing. To reach that consummation, to extirpate it at the root—where only it can be extirpated—a third factor must be called into action, the spiritual element in the soul, and this Calvinism did. Hence in Protestant Europe art practically died out. The religious houses were suppressed. The monks were homeless wanderers. The abbeys were secularized; and when not pulled down turned into private mansions; dwellings for the

favorites upon whom they were bestowed, and who hung their chambers with the vestments and tapestries of the altars. The secular clergy of all classes were impoverished by the spoliations they were subjected to. The irreverence of the demoralized and brutalized multitude helped to complete the wreck which the fanatics had made. The nobles and courtiers, among whom the houses and lands of the Church and the riches of the shrines were distributed, could not in the nature of the things be patrons of art, and no other class had the means of exercising patronage. There was no longer any incentive to the production of art, and no class or institution to sustain the artist. There was no longer employment for him, and no hope of employment. He belonged to the world before the flood and found himself an alien and anachronism. He therefore disappeared from the scene to reappear in another age. But, oh! how fallen, how changed!

Of all the religious movements in the history of the race, the "Reformation" is the only one that has proved utterly sterile on the side of art. It has produced no new architecture, no new painting or sculpture, no new music, not even a new ritual. Whatever it possesses of æsthetic quality in its temples and services, is derived from the Church. Israel, standing in the midst of idolatrous nations, was forbidden the use of images; but Solomon built the temple of the God of Israel on Mount Zion, for no subtlety of imagination or magical rite can pervert architectural forms which are geometrical figures into likenesses of living things or supernatural personalities; and yet inside in the "most holy house" were the two cherubims of "image work," standing in the light of their golden wings twenty cubits long, extending from wall to wall of that house, and typifying, if we may be permitted to say so, the bright cloud that one day was to overshadow Mount Tabor. There were also graven cherubims on the walls, and wrought cherubims on the veil of blue and purple, and crimson and fine linen; and the molten images of oxen supporting the Molten Sea—so inevitable is the affinity of powerful supernatural ideas for form and color. But outside the walls of the temple in Jerusalem, in Judea, throughout the land of the Twelve Tribes, no image was to be seen, no household god under any roof, no monumental stone on any high place or haunted hollow. The danger of idolatry was imminent, and the fear of it intense and all pervading during the brief hour of Israel's prime. Consequently there was no art, and no place or function for art, among the Jews; but the stream of æsthetic feeling, dammed on one side, flowed out with more power and volume on that which was open to it, and accordingly music and song became the chief mediums of expression of that people. The harp of David was consecrated to the

Lord, and thrilled with sublimer strains than Apollo's lute. He clad his lofty prayers in the concord of sweet sounds. All primitive music was religious music. Christian psalmody had its origin in the temple. The Jew, debarred from painting and sculpture, has ever since, especially since the Dispersion, found compensation in the art which borrows nothing from the external world but the vibrations of the molecules of the atmosphere. Even Mohammedanism, fiercely fanatical as it is, and abhorrent of the image, has developed an art of its own possessing nobleness and individuality, and distinguished also by original architectural features and a fertility and brilliancy of ornamentation never surpassed. As in the case of Judaism, from which it sprang, architecture was not forbidden to the Arab faith. Caliphs and commanders of the faithful, and their lieutenants, hastened to build palaces and mosques in the principal cities of the kingdoms they subjugated. Many of these buildings still exist, and rank high in the category of architectural creations. Witness the mosques of Cairo, the Jussuf Mosque in Tunis, the Pearl Mosque of Agra, the Tajh Mahal, the Mosque of Omar, the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, the Alhambra. The interiors were profusely decorated in the bright colors of glass mosaics, with geometrical patterns of inexhaustible variety, endless interlacing, and even conventional animal and floral forms; and the windows of many of them are of painted glass, and still shine like jewels.¹ Their system of ornamentation penetrated deeply into all industries, producing beautiful tissues and exquisite objects of all kinds, in metal, clay, and ivory.

The shrines of Ceylon and Japan show that the mighty Buddha, who really was a reformer, has a soul for art as well as for the whole sentient creation. How long his powers will last is another question. For a form of Protestantism in the guise of modern civilization has entered his dominions. The Mikado is suppressing monasteries and appropriating their estates. The court ladies have discarded the national costume and wear the fabrications of Worth. The effect of this European invasion will certainly be the extinction of the national genius and the degradation of the national character. Protestantism, as far as art is concerned, is manifestly not a creative, but a destructive and petrifying principle. It ploughs with the ploughshare of ruin, and sows the furrows with salt.

If art was "quenched like fire" in Protestant countries, its lustre was dimmed in Catholic countries. The mephitic blasts from the

¹ The Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem is especially celebrated for its windows. There is no doubt that Arab art sprang from Byzantine art, though the pointed arch, it is said, is of Arab origin.

banks of the Elbe and of the Lake of Zurich blew chill and heavy on the banks of the Arno and the Tiber. Protestantism entered Italy in more than one form, and, according to Sismondi, made considerable progress among the literati. We know that Clement Marot and Calvin found asylum there when they fled from France. We have seen what the German Lutherans accomplished in Rome; and the moral effect of their work there, and in the other Italian cities which they entered, could not have been other than disastrous. The face of heaven was now overcast by the spirit of the age, which was the spirit of the "Reformation;" and as the heavenly hierarchies grew faint in the skies, they faded out of art. Fortune seemed to smile on the enemies of the Church, and the worldly, who are always a great multitude, are seduced by her smile, and follow her banner.¹ Doubt shook many minds, and where doubt failed to penetrate, despondency entered. Inspiration, if it had not entirely vanished, was a rare visitant in the studio. Cold imitation was substituted for invention. "We paint what we love," says Taine; and we love and can love only what we believe in as really existing. The loss of faith was the cause of the extinction of art in one region; the decline of faith was the cause of the decline of art in another. But many secondary causes contributed to the decline of Italian art; the most formidable of which was the succession of the bloody wars of France on the one side, and Germany and Spain on the other, in which the Papacy and the minor states were almost always involved. The discovery of the new route to India impoverished the maritime cities, indeed all the cities, and they have never recovered from the blow. The fall of the central republics, Florence, Sienna, Lucca, Genoa, followed. Venice alone remained; but she, too, was losing her oriental trade, the great source of her wealth and splendor. The Spaniards became masters, though not protectors, of the country, which was scourged for long years by corsairs from without and brigands from within, who carried on their depredations with impunity. Freedom, commerce, and industry were overthrown; poverty overspread the land, paralysis fell on the body politic, and lethargy on the Church. Art could no longer flourish in such a dismal and chaotic world. Independent Italy consisted merely of Venice and the Papal states. But at this very time Wisdom descended again on the Papacy in tongues

¹ "And I who straightway looked beheld a flag,
Which, whirling round so rapidly
That it no pause obtained; and following came
Such a long train of spirits, I should ne'er
Have thought that death so many had despoiled."

Cary's "Dante," Canto third.

of fire. The Papacy arose to the full height of its spiritual stature. Its creative energies, which had slumbered during the reign of the lotus-eating Pontiffs of the Renaissance, started into new life and worked as in the days of Gregory the Seventh and Innocent the Third. The Tiara shone from a troubled sky, a guiding star, on the nations emerging from the deluge of the "Reformation." The revival of religion spread far and fast, and, in obedience to the eternal law, was followed by the revival of art.

"ROBERT ELSMERE" AS A CONTROVERSIAL NOVEL.

THE novel of Mrs. Humphrey Ward, "Robert Elsmere," has excited very great interest, both in England and in the United States. We would rather leave to more competent hands the pronouncing on the literary merits of the book. They must be of no mean quality if we are to take the sudden popularity which the book has acquired as a standard of real sterling worth. We presume, however, that the interest which it has commanded can be partly accounted for by the controversial portion of the book, if the one-sided argument made in favor of Rationalism and against orthodox Christianity can be graced with the name of controversy. In fact, we are free to confess to be at a loss to discover the intention of the gifted authoress in filling and inoculating her book with so much theological lore. We have a shrewd guess that she intended to make in favor of Christianity one of those arguments called *ex absurdis*. The reasons which commend such a guess to our minds, and which invest it with a very great probability in our eyes, are, first, the general tendency of the book and the conclusion which all fair-minded readers must draw from it. The general tendency of the book, that which gives it charm and attraction in the reader's sight, is the beauty of the life of the real Christian characters introduced in it and the general hatefulness excited in them by the characters of infidels and Rationalists or worldly persons. Catharine, the real heroine of the book, is a charming character, not so much on account of her natural gifts, but because her life is the exemplification of a Christian who lives by faith. As a young girl, she accomplishes with scrupulous fidelity, earnestness and perseverance the difficult task imposed

upon her by her dying father—that of being a prop and a stay to her widowed mother, and of bringing up her sisters in the Christian faith and morality, and she adorns and fills this life-task with daily acts of most self-sacrificing benevolence. She is a model wife in spite of the great change which comes over her husband, and which is like the snapping of her very life, the ebbing away of her life-blood, filling her whole future life with unutterable anguish, trials which she bears with Christian fortitude and magnanimity, remaining true and faithful to her husband to the very end; but clinging more steadfastly and more tenaciously to her living Saviour and God.

Whatever beauty appears in the character of the hero himself, it comes to him inasmuch as he realizes the type of a Christian, both when a believer in the supernatural, as the rector of a parish, the originator and the centre of every humane and charitable deed, and when, having given up orthodox Christianity, he continues to be inspired by Christ, alas! in his darkened vision no longer God, but at least the best, the grandest, the sublimest human realization of purity of character and purpose, of justice and of goodness.

The characters in the novel representing modern infidelity and Rationalism are anything but attractive. And first, the squire, a bookworm, a half-crazy, intensely selfish man, who lets his tenantry be oppressed by a drunken brute of a steward, and who condescends to afford them some help and relief in their misery and wretchedness for no higher motive than to please the minister, whose faith he takes great delight in shaking and uprooting.

The next cynical character is Langham, another Rationalist and infidel, who, in order to indulge in his misanthropic habits, gives up his tutorship in Oxford and behaves as a selfish brute to a poor innocent girl who has foolishly condescended to notice him. Grey is another Rationalist, of the world, and rather of the nonentity style, practically speaking.

The other characters are of the common, worldly, everyday stamp of their class. Surely, if the authoress had intended to set off the Christian character in opposition to the infidel, and the result of the Christian faith in the lives of the real believer as contrasted with the effect of infidelity in the character of its upholders, with a view of emphasizing the saying of the Gospel, "from their fruit ye shall know them," she could not have written a better apology of orthodox Christianity.

That such must have been her intention appears also from the manner in which the upholders of Rationalism and their arguments are introduced. There is a hidden, silent, underlying something which steals upon the reader and gradually takes possession of him, that Christianity has not much to say for itself, and that

its historical evidence does not and cannot stand the test of criticism ; whereas, on the other hand, it seems to be taken for granted that the proof against it is not only complete and perfect, but absolutely invulnerable and unshaken. Mind you, you are not told so in any particular place, or in so many words, but the thing steals on you, and if you are not wide awake, takes possession of you. Here is a sample, taken at random :

Elsmere tells Langham that he intends to take orders and to preach. Langham answers :

"Well, after all," he said at last very slowly, "the difficulty lies in preaching anything. One may as well preach respectable mythology as anything else."

"What do you mean by mythology?" asked Robert, hotly.

"Simply ideas or experiences personified (that is, ideas which are vested with all the individual circumstances of persons who have them). I take it they are the subject-matter of all theologies."

Robert answers and contends that Christian theology is a system of ideas made manifest in facts. Langham answers dryly, "How do you know they are facts?"

The young man takes up the challenge and the conversation resolves itself into a discussion of Christian evidences. Or, rather, "Robert held forth and Langham kept him going by an occasional remark which acted like the prick of a spur. The tutor's psychological curiosity was soon satisfied. He declared to himself that the intellect had precious little to do with Elsmere's Christianity. He had got hold of all the stock apologetic arguments and used them, his companion admitted, with ability and ingenuity."

We are very much mistaken if such superciliousness on the part of Rationalists in treating the subject of Christian evidences, if such tone does not give the reader a decidedly mean idea of Christianity and of its proofs. Then look at the interlocutors. They are represented as prodigies of intellectual acumen and sharpness, as wonders of erudition and of application, as consummate scholars, as individual geniuses, before whom all must necessarily sink into insignificance. Here are some words which Elsmere addresses to the squire: "I think we ought to understand one another, perhaps, Mr. Wendover," Robert said, speaking under a quick sense of oppression, but with his usual dignity and bright courtesy. "I know your opinions, of course, from your book; you know what mine, as an honest man, must be from the position I hold. My conscience does not forbid me to discuss anything, only *I am no match for you on points of scholarship*, and I should just like to say, once for all, that to me, whatever else is true, the religion of Christ is true."

In the conversation which gives the last blow to Robert's faith

in Christianity the same squire is introduced, and the defender of Christianity is, of course, only a young, liberal Catholic, a pale, small, hectic creature, the author of a remarkable collection of essays on mediæval subjects, a Mr. Wishart. The latter makes an extravagant remark which catches the squire's attention, and an argument is entered into which becomes for a moment a serious trial of strength. What was said on both sides is not told us by the authoress, but the result, of course, is in favor of the giant and against the puny young Catholic, and is seen by the woeful effect it has on Elsmere. "As the talk went on the rector in the background got paler and paler; his eyes, as they passed from the mobile face of the Catholic convert to the bronzed visage of the squire, got duller, more instinct with a slowly dawning despair."

Now we argue: certainly the authoress of the book, in the love of fair play, which is the boast of Englishmen, could not have seriously meant to have represented a real *bona fide* controversy between orthodox Christianity and Rationalism, and then placed all the advantage in the genius, ability, scholarship and experience of the persons engaged in it all on one side. She could not certainly have meant such a thing. She knew, of course, that when in a supposed controversy the advantage is all on one side, the other side's case must necessarily remain invulnerable and unassailable in the eyes of all honest men.

But what may really prove our guess to be correct, that our authoress meant to make an argument, *ex absurdis*, in favor of Christianity, is the necessarily weak nature of the reasons and grounds which are alleged by Rationalists against the evidences of Christianity, and which she puts and arranges with infinite skill and address. It is these arguments which shook the faith of Elsmere and caused it to totter and to fall that we intend to examine, not that they are anything new to scholars or theologians, but because they may have some show of power over minds that are untrained and unskilled in these matters, or on readers who pass too carelessly over a book and are unfit to pause and ponder over assertions which are made so categorically and which appear to be serious and to be fraught with some real meaning and import.

To facilitate the understanding of the subject, we may remark that Christianity, being a system of truths embodied and incorporated in a series of facts, must necessarily depend, as to its truth or falsehood, upon the value which is attached to such facts, and these in their turn upon the reliableness of human testimony, and must stand or fall as human testimony is proven to stand or to fall. For instance, the resurrection of our Blessed Lord is a fact which depends on the reliability of the source from which we have it, those who stand up as witnesses of the supposed fact. Hence the

truth or falsehood of the series of facts upon which Christianity rests, which make up, as it were, the whole Christianity, depends on two questions. The first is: What is the value of human testimony in general? The second is: Are the facts of Christianity really supported by reliable and trustworthy testimony? The first is the general thesis, the second is the application of the thesis to a particular order of facts. Our readers can see that the whole question here depends on the answer to the first problem: What is the value of human testimony? Because, if no value is attached to such testimony, all the facts depending and resting upon its trustworthiness must fall to the ground. Now, in the book which we are criticizing, all the efforts are directed against the general thesis, in shaking or explaining away the reliableness of human testimony, and the attack which rebounds on Christianity from such efforts must have its consequence on the whole science of history. The attack is prepared most skilfully. In page 222 (Hurst & Co., N. Y.) Elsmere having told Langham that he is thinking of writing a historical book, the latter says: "There is one thing that doesn't seem to have touched you yet, but you will come to it. To my mind it makes almost the chief interest of history. It is just this: History depends on testimony. What is the nature and the value of testimony at given times? In other words, did the man of the third century understand, or report, or interpret facts in the same way as the man of the sixteenth or the nineteenth? And if not, what are the differences and what the deductions to be made from them, if any?"

Elsmere answers: "It is enormously important, I grant—enormously," he repeated reflectively.

"I should think it is," said Langham to himself as he rose, "the whole of orthodox Christianity is in it, for instance."

Here the thesis is clearly stated in its general sense, though Elsmere does not fully realize its import, according to the general system of our authoress in representing the Christian disputants as always of a mental capacity much inferior to that of the opponents of Revelation.

But in the second part of the book, page 350, the meaning of the question is more fully explained. "Testimony," says Mr. Wendover, "like every other human product, has developed man's power of apprehending and recording what he sees and hears, has grown from less to more, from weaker to stronger, like any other of his faculties, just as the reasoning powers of the cave-dwellers have developed into the reasoning powers of a Kant."

Let us examine carefully the above statements, after trying to define the exact meaning of the authoress, who has thrown a very great amount of confusion into them, whether purposely or from

want of skill in handling philosophical subjects, we cannot very well decide.

First, it is affirmed that man's power of apprehending and recording what he sees and hears has grown from less to more, from weaker to stronger.

The object of such apprehending and recording seems to be very clearly pointed out, and yet it is not so. What one sees certainly appertains to an outward, external, sensible object. But what one hears does not necessarily imply a sensible object, because one may listen to a discussion of the highest metaphysical subjects and, if not well trained in such things, may not apprehend their import.

Then there is a great difference, as regards truth and evidence, between what one himself sees and what he may hear from others. What one sees himself is evidenced to him by the testimony of his own eyes, whereas the truth and reliableness of what he hears depend on the knowledge and the veracity of the narrator.

Again, there is a wide difference between apprehending what one sees and recording it. One may be in every way competent to see and ascertain an event, and yet may not be able to properly record it.

All these different questions, therefore, should not be confounded together, but should be treated separately, speaking first of the power of apprehending what one sees and afterwards of the others. Now, this power is asserted by the squire to be progressive from less to more, as the powers of a cave-dweller have been developed into those of Kant. We have not such exalted ideas of the reasoning powers of the latter philosopher as our authoress. We consider him as not much better than a skeptic and a sophist; and hence the contrast must necessarily lose upon our mind that force which our gifted authoress intended. We decline, also, to have anything to do with cave-dwellers or any such mysterious people, about whom neither the authoress nor we do know, or can know, very much.

Limiting, then, our problem to outward, sensible facts, such as can be the object of our senses, and especially the eyes, and confining our inquiry to civilized times, we may put the question—Is it true that man's power of apprehending what he sees has grown from less to more, from weaker to stronger?

Reason and common sense must give a flat and unqualified denial to such a question. The reason is as simple as it is undeniable. The eye of man was as good nineteen centuries ago as it is at the present day; and if the object which it was to behold was an outward, external, sensible fact, we cannot make out any reason why it could not have seen it to its heart's content then as it can

now ; and why it could not place as much reliance on itself then as it does at present, the organ of vision being the same and the objects of a sensible nature, the relation between the organ and its object must be the same at all times and in all places. The testimony of man's eyes, then, cannot be subject to variation or progress from less to more, from weaker to stronger. Given all the conditions exacted by optics to realize the vision of an object, the testimony of the eye must be always the same, uniform, stable and unchangeable.

We deny, then, that the testimony of the eye is variable and progressive and relative to time and space, both as to the faculty of observing and as to the reliability of its observation ; and the eye-witnesses of the early period of Christianity are entitled to the same confidence as the eyes of any or of all Rationalists put together, provided that the two conditions which are absolutely necessary to render human testimony a criterion of truth be verified.

These conditions, as every one knows, are, first, that the witnesses have really, unmistakably, and without any fear of deception, observed the facts for which they vouch, and have acquired a subjective certainty about them. Secondly, that they state them truthfully and under such circumstances as to render any conspiracy for deception on their part utterly impossible.

We are using the plural number, witnesses, because, though it might be contended, as it has been by some, that one witness is entitled to perfect confidence when those two conditions are realized, yet, to avoid all possible difficulty, we require for the absolute reliableness of human testimony a number of eye-witnesses ; because all human testimony, necessarily and originally, must start from those who have themselves observed the facts.

There are infallible rules to ascertain when those two conditions have been complied with, and once that has been ascertained human testimony takes its rank among the criteria of truth, and must create a certainty about the facts it testifies to. The reason is, that if there could be a deception in such case, it would reflect upon God, the Creator and Ruler of the human family. If man is a social being, if he must live in society and fellowship with other men, if such society is realized principally in a mutual interchange of ideas, of facts, of confidence and reliance, if all this is not limited to one generation of men, but embraces all generations, at all times and in all places, one generation handing over to the following generation the whole patrimony it received from a former one, together with the addition it has itself made, and this to another, it stands to reason that if human testimony, even when properly examined and sifted in every possible way, were open to

mistake, to error, to deception, the bond keeping human society together would be dissolved, there would no longer be a human family, the design of the Creator would miserably and wretchedly fail. We should then give up all historical certainty, we should abolish all possible intercourse among men, and fall back upon the savage and misanthropic state.

We will not dwell at any great length upon the other two questions, whether the power of apprehending and recording what one hears is variable or not. Those two questions depend upon the first, as all human testimony must of necessity fall back upon the eye-witness. Because, in order to yield our assent to what we hear, or to what certain records may testify, it is absolutely necessary to carefully and closely examine on what grounds the statements rest which we are called upon to believe; and if, after the proper examination and the most scrupulous inquiry, they turn out to be reliable and worthy of our confidence, it shall be found that they are supported by the testimony of eye-witnesses who were neither deceived themselves nor disposed to deceive others, and could not do it even if so inclined.

Human testimony, therefore, in the last analysis resolves itself into that of the eye-witness, and it is and can be neither relative to time or place, nor progressive when its object is an outward, sensible, public fact; and when accompanied with those two conditions spoken of, it is a perfectly reliable criterion of truth.

But our authoress by her mouth-piece, the Squire, insists that it is progressive, and that it can be proven to be so by history and experience, and it is our duty to listen to the proof. "What one wants is the ordered proof of this, and it can be got from history and experience." And to pave the way for such a proof, we are told that "to plunge into the Christian period, without having first cleared the mind as to what is meant in history and literature by the critical method, is to invite fiasco."

We might demur against such condition, and insist on being satisfied with examining the credibility of human testimony according to reason or common sense, because either the critical method is founded on reason and common sense, and then it must be all the same to the authoress; or it is not supported by those two requisites for a man to find out the truth, and then it ought to be spurned as worthless. But we will be over-indulgent for the time being, and study this great bug-bear in history and literature—the critical method.

Pray, what is the critical method in history and literature? "In history it is the science of what is credible, in literature it is the science of what is rational." We begin to acquire some kind of respect for the critical method, for it promises wondrous things,

yet we must request a little more light and beg of it to explain what is credible and what is rational, because without that explanation we are pretty much where we were before. Well, then, what is credible and what is rational?

We presume that none will dispute that a method is the manner of doing a thing, or of inquiring into a subject, according to certain rules derived from principles applicable to the thing to be done or to the matter to be inquired into. In every method, therefore, there is a process directed by certain rules which are drawn from certain principles applicable to the matter in hand. How is a naturalist, for instance, to proceed in the investigation of some natural phenomenon? What method shall he follow? Surely the method of observation, which prescribes certain rules to be complied with: 1st. a careful examination of the phenomenon by every experiment in his power, first by sight and other senses, then by means of instruments, the best adapted for the investigation, then to confirm his results by experiment in the inverse ratio when possible, and so forth.

These rules are founded upon certain principles which any one may guess. Method, then, depends on rules, and rules originate in principles. The critical method, to usurp such a pompous title, must then proceed from certain rules in the investigation of its object, and these must be derived from certain principles applicable to and bearing upon the subject. It undertakes to give us rules to find out what is credible and what is rational. It must then have the monopoly of knowing what is credible and what is rational.

How did it come by such a monopoly? Who gave it such an exclusive right? Where are the documents to prove it? Such a claim, as the supporters of the critical method urge, is the very climax and sublimity of pretension. They set themselves up to teach mankind what is credible and what is incredible, what is rational and what is irrational, and assume in consequence of this modest claim that all such as prove restive to submit to such despotism and insolence are very low in the scale of intelligence, simply dupes, ready to gulp down any amount of the veriest trash and rubbish. See how disparaging and contemptuously Mr. Wendover speaks of these: "The theologian in such a state (that is, who has not cleared his mind by the critical method) sees no obstacle to accepting any arbitrary (?) list of documents, with all the strange stuff they may contain, and declaring them to be sound historical material, whilst he applies to all the strange stuff they may contain of a similar kind surrounding them the most vigorous principles of modern science." What proof has Mr. Wendover for

all this? None whatever, except that it must be so because the theologians have not cleared their minds with the critical method. What is this but silly and extravagant impertinence, not to be tolerated if said of any other class of persons, but admissible because applied to Christian historians and theologians?

The secret of these critics and of their method is that they want you to lay down as an absolutely certain and infallible principle, that whatever in history may savor of supernatural, miraculous, super-intelligible, must be discarded *a priori*, handled without gloves or consideration, rejected, eliminated, spurned with utter contempt, and ranked among the incredible and the irrational and the absurd. It is then and not till then that they allow you to examine with a clear mind the historical documents in favor of Christianity.

The rules they assign are of a piece, and in perfect conformity with such principle. Let us see. "Suppose," says Mr. Wendover, "before I begin to deal with the Christian story and the earliest Christian development, I try to make out beforehand what are the moulds, the channels into which the testimony of the time must run. I look for these moulds, of course, in the dominant ideas, the intellectual pre-conceptions and pre-occupations existing when the period begins." It seems, then, that the first rule of the critical method is to interpret testimony by the mould and channels into which it must run, and these are to be found in the dominant ideas of the period.

We have much to say on this rule. First, is it founded on reason? Mark well that we are talking of testimony as to outward, sensible, public facts, and not of opinions to be passed upon them. If it were a question of passing an opinion upon certain facts, the pre-conceived ideas and pre-occupations in the mind of those who are to pass such judgment might influence, mould, or modify that opinion. But the question is as to verifying and testifying to a fact. An event occurs, it takes place in daylight, in public, in the market-place, hundreds can see and touch it, so to speak. What have the ideas, pre-conceptions and pre-occupations of the spectators got to do with the mere ascertaining of that event which passes under their own observation? Can they, as honest men, proclaim that they don't see what is staring them in the face because they may happen to have some ideas and pre-conceptions? Can they stultify themselves and refuse to yield to the testimony of their senses? If, then, the ascertaining of a sensible public fact has no connection whatever with the ideas and bias of the mind of the spectators, the rule is false.

In the second place, suppose that an event must be interpreted, qualified, limited according to the ideas and pre-conceptions of

those who verify and testify to it, what then? Does that necessarily shake the force of that testimony? It may or may not; the decision depends on whether those ideas and pre-conceptions be true or false. If they be true, the testimony will receive strength by the channel into which it runs. If they be false, the testimony may be affected by the falsity of the medium. The rule, then, even if allowed, would prove naught against Christian testimony, unless it was demonstrated, not by assumptions and arbitrary statements, but by positive proofs, that the ideas and pre-conceptions and pre-occupations of the spectators and witnesses of the facts were false and untenable.

Again, the rule must work both ways; it must apply to the early Christian witnesses, when the Christian period began, as well as to our sublime critics of the present day. The ideas, pre-conceptions and pre-occupations of the latter are dead set against anything supernatural, wonderful, miraculous, above and beyond the grossest materialism; such pre-conceptions against all that takes the shape and form of the most intense and enraged hatred and contempt; such ideas, pre-conceptions and pre-occupations have not even the shadow of reason or proof, but are assumed, *a priori*, without discussion, without admitting even the possibility of the contrary; and upon those ideas is proclaimed what is credible and what is rational. How, then, can any reasonable man expect that Christianity will consider such critics fit to examine and to judge its historical documents and proofs? Therefore, by applying their own rule to these methodic critics, we have a right to pronounce them as utterly and absolutely incompetent to judge of Christian history and Christian testimony.

But to proceed. Is it true that the ideas and pre-conceptions of the world when the Christian period began were in favor of Christianity beyond a general belief in the supernatural, which is the instinctive feeling of human nature, and the expression of which is signalled at all times and in all places? That is what Mr. Wendover asserts, and that is what the craven ignoramus, the Rev. Robert Elsmere, allowed to pass without a remark.

"In the first place," says the Squire, "I shall find present in the age which saw the birth of Christianity, as in so many other ages, a universal pre-conception in favor of miracles, that is to say, of deviation from common norm of experience governing the work of all men and of all schools. Very well, allow for it then."

The reverend gentleman might have replied: "On your own assertion, sir, the miracle is a universal pre-conception, not only of that age, but of many other ages." Does it not, then, occur to you that belief in the supernatural and the miraculous may be the

common patrimony of mankind? And is it not also at the present time the universal belief of mankind, with the exception of the few great geniuses, bold spirits, the would-be *élite* of the world, those who are led by the critical method? Besides, he could have asked, is such a belief true or false? If it be true, it matters very little whether the witnesses at the dawn of Christianity were inclined to such a belief or not. And have critics and philosophers and scientists ever furnished the slightest proof that it is false? Does not the sum total of their proof amount to this—that, given the principle that everything miraculous must be rejected, we proclaim the history of Christianity of no value whatever?

Besides, he might have added, we deny absolutely that the world at the beginning of Christianity was in any particular way inclined to or biassed in favor of the miracle and the supernatural beyond the common universal belief and craving of mankind in and after some supernatural union and intercourse with the Divinity. He could easily have proved that from the leading historical facts of those days. And it would have been in vain for the Squire to contradict him and to cry out: "The wonder would have been to have had a life of Christ without miracles. The air teems with them. The East is full of Messiahs. Even Tacitus is superstitious. Even Vespasian works miracles. Even a Nero cannot die, but fifty years after his death is still looked for as the inaugurator of a millennium of horror." We say it would have been useless for the Squire to allege such things as a predisposition of the Jewish and the Roman world in favor of Christianity, because he ought to have known that the religious pre-conceptions of the Jews and the Paganism of the Romans were the greatest and the most powerful antagonists Christianity had to cope with, and if it came victorious from the fight it was only after meeting and encountering three centuries of the fiercest and most furious attacks, and after shedding the heart's blood of millions of her pontiffs and of her children. Whatever religious ideas, then, pre-conceptions, pre-occupations in favor of the miraculous and the supernatural existed among the Jewish and Pagan nations, they were all used against, not in favor of, Christianity; and the mould and the channel into which Christian testimony had to run were among the fiercest and the worst of her foes.

This remark disposes also of the pre-conceptions flowing from the pre-Christian apocalyptic literature of the Jews, because all these served as so many tools and weapons against Christianity.

Mr. Elsmere lets another great blunder pass without any observation. The Squire condescends to give the definition of miracle. "Miracle, that is, deviation from the common norm of

experience governing the work of all men and of all schools." The definition is somewhat ambiguous. Does Mr. Wendover mean that a miracle is the deviation of the common norm of experience, inasmuch as it does not, and cannot be, the subject of the ordinary observation of men? If such be his meaning, as we suspect, he is sadly mistaken.

The miracle is an outward sensible fact subject to the observation of our senses, the same, in every respect, as a natural, *bona fide* phenomenon or event. Take any miracle recorded in the Gospel, say, for instance, the restoring to life of the son of the widow of Naim. Our Lord happens to be walking in the public way followed by His disciples. They reach the gate of the city. A funeral passes by. The only son of a widowed mother is being carried to the grave; a great number of friends and acquaintances accompany the bier where the remains of the young man lie. So far everything is natural, there is or can be no deviation from the common norm of experience; the large multitude of people see the bier, behold the remains of the dead, and sympathize with the poor mother, and see our Lord approach and touch the bier, and those who carry it come to a stop. The next thing they hear is our Lord uttering those solemn words, "Young man, I say to thee, arise." Immediately after these words, to their great astonishment, they see him who was dead sit up, and hear him speak, and with the help of our Lord leap from the bier and run up to his mother.

Pray, where is the deviation from the common norm of experience? What is strange about it? The young man being alive is a fact ascertainable by the same senses which observed him dead, his sitting up in the bier in obedience to the omnipotent voice of Christ, his talking, his leaping down from the bier, his standing strong and erect before that multitude of spectators, his running to embrace his mother, are the continuation of the same fact falling under the observation of the same faculties. Where is the difference, the departure from the common norm of experience? And we beg to remark that this is in perfect conformity with the common rule commanding the work of all men and of all schools. They observe an event, a fact, a natural phenomenon, and they conclude a law; but the fact is observed by the senses; it is reason which argues the law. The senses in the spectators of a miracle observe a sensible fact, an event which, inasmuch as it falls within the province of the senses, is as much a fact as any other in the universe; and the senses know and can know nothing of the agency which has produced it; this is supplied by the reason of the spectators who observe the fact. The reverend gentleman letting such a blunder pass unnoticed gives evidence that he knew nothing about miracles any more than Mr. Wendover himself.

What remains of the harangue of the Squire is of a piece with the premises. "Be prepared for the inevitable differences between it and the testimony of our own day." The difference exists only in the fertile brain of the skeptic. "The witness of the time is not true, nor in a strict sense false. It is merely incompetent, half-trained, but all through perfectly natural." Having demonstrated that to be a thoroughly competent witness, it is not necessary to belong to the self-appointed critical club of the gentlemen who reject *a priori*, all which does not square with their ideas and preconceptions; the evident conclusion must be that the early Christian testimony is supported by perfectly qualified witnesses.

Before closing up our remark we wish to notice the following words of the harangue: "The resurrection is partly invented, partly imagined, partly ideally true, in any case wholly intelligible and natural as a product of the age, when once you have the key of that age."

We have proved that it is not at all necessary to use that key so kindly and so officiously furnished by the Squire. We have proved, moreover, that after all the key may be the right one, and instead of explaining away the facts may only confirm them more and more; that it was the business of Mr. Wendover, and of all un-Christian, rationalistic, infidel critics to prove first that key to be a false one, a thing which they do not as much as dream of doing. On what ground, then, do they conclude with the Squire: "The resurrection is partly invented, partly imagined, partly ideally true." Why not say at once it is absolutely and wretchedly false?

A fact of such immense importance, which is attested by a number of witnesses in the full and complete possession of their senses, witnesses stubbornly set against it; a fact, the observation and verification of which are repeated again and again, now by the apostles and then by the disciples, once by as many as five hundred in number; a fact which one of the witnesses stubbornly declared he would never believe unless he could see it with his own eyes and touch with his own hands, both of which things he had ample opportunity of doing; a fact which was never denied by those who had every possible reason to do so, the whole Jewish priesthood, all the Sanhedrim, the sects, Sadducees, Pharisees, Herodians, the whole Jewish people; a fact admitted indirectly by the very soldiery who kept watch over the sepulchre, and who, following the suggestion of the Jews, gave out that whilst they were asleep the Apostles had come and stolen the body away, a suggestion which called forth that celebrated stricture of St. Augustine to the Jews: "Do you make use of sleeping witnesses?" a fact attested by the Apostles after they had become convinced of

it by repeated observations at the expense of everything that a man holds dear, and confirmed and sealed by their blood; a fact which has been examined, scrutinized, sifted, and found unattackable and invulnerable by nineteen centuries of Christian genius, and for the truth of which millions of Christians have shed their blood; a fact which, as soon as proclaimed, produced a moral revolution in the universe and created Christian civilization; a fact on which the Christian Church has been founded, propagated, and continues to live and to resist and survive all the attacks of her enemies; such a fact, we beg the authoress's pardon, cannot be disposed of so summarily and so cavalierly by a few words put in the mouth of a half-crazy squire who ends his days by his own hand in a fit of insanity. It is the very acme of impertinent and impudent self-conceit.

We may be right after all in the guess we ventured to make in the beginning of our article, that the authoress, in the production of her novel, intended to make in favor of Christianity one of those arguments called *ex absurdo*, putting in bold relief the flimsiness of the web of the rationalistic argument by showing in the happiest manner possible how it lacks the very pretext of a reasonable foundation, and by emphasizing their modest and shrinking pretensions to be possessed of the exclusive right to know and to teach what is credible and what is rational under the penalty for any transgressor of losing caste, and "falling *ipso facto* out of court with men of education."—(Page 351.)

THE PAPACY AS AN INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL.

1. *Le Tribunal International*, par le Comte L. Kamarowsky, professeur de droit international à l'Université de Moscou; précédé d'une *Introduction* par Jules Lacointa, ancien Avocat Général à la Cour de Cassation, professeur de droit des gens à l'Institut Catholique de Paris, etc.
2. *Conférence Internationale de la Croix Rouge à Genève*. Discours prononcé le 2 Septembre, 1884, par Jules Lacointa.
3. *Le dernier projet de Code Pénal Italien*. Lettre à M. Zanardelli, Garde des Sceaux, etc., du Royaume d'Italie, par Jules Lacointa. 1888.
4. *La Magistrature et la Crise Judiciaire*, par Jules Lacointa. 1880.

NO question has occupied, in our century, the attention of statesmen and jurists, or has been discussed by legislators and journalists, that surpasses or even equals in practical importance the subject treated of by Count Kamarowsky, in his masterly work, "Le Tribunal International," and completed by the most eminent of French jurists, Jules Lacointa, in the no less masterly "Introduction" written for the Paris edition. Let us deal with this "Introduction," in the first place; the horizons it opens up, the lofty principles it vindicates, and the practical considerations it urges upon governments and peoples, will prepare us to understand and appreciate the mighty import of Count Kamarowsky's treatise.

I.

The manifold costliness of the twelve millions of armed men kept on foot by the European nations; the intolerable burdens imposed on the tax-payers; the entire youth and manhood of so many countries taken away from domestic life and the walks of the most needful and profitable industry; the hoarded wealth of what was once Christendom, and all the resources of the most advanced science, applied to the discovery and use of the most destructive agencies and implements, and the black war-cloud which now hangs over Europe, continental and insular, pregnant with the ruin of empires and the death of millions of human beings;—all this pleads for PEACE and for the recognition of a mediator and arbiter between nations clothed with the authority of the divine "Prince of Peace."

The terrifying vision of danger to her supremacy is frightening

Great Britain into creating a new navy. Is it not the resolve to avert possible war from our own borders which stimulates our Government and Congress to erect sea-coast defences, and to have the American flag borne on every sea by armed vessels, powerful enough and numerous enough to render peace certain in our free and prosperous country, by making war a very remote possibility?

It is well that among a people who have no rivals to fear on the American continent, and who have no ambition to enlarge the magnificent patrimony Providence has given them, there should spring up those associations which aim to do away with war and to secure peace, blessed and permanent peace, to the human family.

"One cannot do too much," says M. Lacointa, "to render war less cruel and of less frequent occurrence. All that can be taken away from war is a gift toward the prosperity of states, the vitality and fortune of nations.

"If man is powerless to stop this plague altogether, it concerns him to lessen its fearful effects. It would be much to prevent frequently the recourse to arms, to exhaust, in order to prevent it, all the means of arriving at a peaceful solution.

"Law-suits between private persons are, generally, only authorized after having tried conciliation; it should be the same between states. When private dissensions arise, people do not rush to take up arms; in such cases violence is forbidden; courts are established to decide on the cause of quarrel. Why, then, should violence, instead of being a rare exception, become the principal form of terminating international disputes? Because there is no judge between states; the absence of a superior authority leaves, all too often, no other issue but hostilities."

This is the generative idea of the joint work of Count Kamarowsky and M. Lacointa; indeed, we may say, it was this need of "a Judge between States," of "a Superior Authority," recognized as arbiter by the entire civilized world, that set men's minds a-thinking on both sides of the Atlantic, and gave rise, directly or indirectly, to all the "Peace Congresses" assembled in our day.

Nor, as we shall see, have these peace congresses and associations borne no solid nor salutary fruit.

M. Lacointa glances at the various institutions, both among ancient and modern peoples, established to prevent the frequent and unnecessary recurrence of wars. The persons charged with pronouncing on such a necessity were always judged to be "most enlightened." In ancient Rome, the college of *Feciales* had to be consulted before war was either decided on or declared. This precaution won the approval of Cicero as well as the warm admiration of Bossuet. "It was a holy institution," said the latter, "which reflects shame on Christians, to whom a God came down

on earth to pacify all things, but has been unable to inspire with sentiments of charity and peace."

In our day, when so long a period of centuries separates Christendom from barbaric times, there is, M. Lacointa justly complains, no sufficient safeguard for securing against destruction and ruin the lives of men and the fortunes of states and citizens.

Is the killing of men in battle a lawful act when the war is an unjust one?

"We do not say, whatever may be the authority of those who maintain the contrary opinion, that no soldier should obey or take any part in the hostilities until a regular decision from a specially competent authority had acknowledged that the war was a rightful one. The duty of obeying one's superior officers, especially in presence of the enemy, is one that may not be discussed. With this reserve, however, and examining the question under the highest social point of view, we ask, ought there not to be judges charged with the responsibility of pronouncing on the *necessity* of taking up arms, *necessitas, non voluntas* ('the *necessity*, not the *will*'), according to the firm declaration of St. Augustine, the *will* being ever disposed toward peace, *necessity* alone compelling to make war?"

Certainly, if a preliminary deliberation, such as that ordered by the *jus feciale* in Pagan Rome, was an acknowledged legal condition toward a declaration of war among Christian peoples, we should have regained a most precious advantage.

"That peoples, growing daily more jealous of their independence, leave it exclusively in the power either of a political assembly or of a sovereign, subject to the influence of all sorts of excitement, the faculty of declaring war without calling to their aid the advice of competent and dispassionate counsellors; that men so wedded to and greedy of liberties often superfluous and of no account should show themselves so reckless of the dearest interests of the family and the nation, is sufficient to astonish and bewilder the most skeptical observer."

Have we Americans not had a bitter experience of such utter recklessness, such unaccountable folly, in the long series of disputes which led to the war of Secession and in the criminal rashness which precipitated us into the first hostilities?

Contrast this inconsistent and irrational mode of proceeding, so prevalent among nations professing to be guided by the maxims of the Gospel, with the practice of the Moslem world. "Not any more than the Consuls and the Senate in Rome," says M. Lacointa, "can the Sultan or his Divan in Constantinople decide by themselves on declaring war (that is, an *offensive* war). Every soldier knows, in Turkey, that unless the College of *Ulemas* has delib-

erated and issued the *fatwa* authorizing the war, he cannot unsheathe his sword. Should he do so otherwise, the ministers of his religion will refuse him burial in consecrated ground, and he will be, according to the Moslem belief, doomed to eternal damnation. Hostilities may not be begun without this authorization, just as they might not in ancient Rome before the decision of the *Feciales*; else, the Sultan would not be obeyed. The *fatwa* has to be published from the top of the minarets and the *Imans* read it in front of the armed battalions."

M. Lacointa, in the absence of a like recognized authority among Christian nations at the present moment, mentions with praise the field instructions issued to the Federal armies during our civil war and the neutralization of ambulances and the inviolableness of wounded soldiers proclaimed in the Convention of Geneva, as well as the prohibition of explosive bullets by the Convention of St. Petersburg. This last step was taken at the suggestion of the Emperor Alexander II., who also, six years afterward, encouraged the meeting of the Conference of Brussels to discuss the laws and usages of modern warfare, the better treatment of military prisoners, a more religious respect for private property on land, and a mitigation of the hardships to which private fortunes are exposed on sea in time of war. All these are partial successes marking the long struggle of justice against violence.

But all these are only temporary expedients, like most of the means for preventing war advocated by Count Kamarowsky, such as *negotiation, kindly offices, mediation, conferences, and congresses.*

In the Divine plan of which the Church and the political constitution of the Christendom created by the Church were to be the realization, there was one Central Authority, essentially mediatorial and peace-making, which fulfilled, so long as Christendom remained united, the office of judge and arbiter between the nations. That this divinely-instituted Central Authority did not effect more toward preventing wars and their consequences throughout the early and middle ages was due to the very nature of the dominant feudalism. It did, however, much more than its greatest admirers have claimed, and, as it is to last through all time, Providence will so direct events as to make rulers and peoples once more look up to its mediation and judgment as to the sole divinely-appointed remedy against the evils of warfare.

But it will interest the reader to hear upon this very point a man who stood in France at the head of his noble profession before conscience and honor bade him descend from his high seat in the magistracy.

"In the Middle Ages Europe possessed an arbitrator to whom, as everybody acknowledges, the nations were indebted for signal

services. The Popes, accepted as magistrates placed over kings and peoples, interposed their authority on many occasions and effected a pacification. In the centre of Christendom was seated a living oracle who decided without appeal on disputes. Law-giver and supreme judge, he restrained feudal anarchy and violence. *The Peace of God* powerfully aided him in his efforts. The spiritual unity of the Church, which had become the mediator among nations, contributed toward founding on the ruins of the Roman world the new society in whose bosom was developed the general concert of states.

"It was no vulgar ambition that inspired Gregory VII. and Innocent III. Whatever opinion one may hold about their aspirations, and how impossible soever of being realized one may judge them to be, there is no denying the grandeur of the conception which led them to undertake their reforms. Under the ascendancy of the head of religion, whose authority was ever on the increase, a Christian international law sprang up, to which a fresh impulse was given by the crusades, the expansive progress of commerce, the propagation of the principles of the law of nature by the teaching of Roman law,—a legacy of the ancient city,—by the discovery, in fine, of the New World. Canon law enunciated axioms adopted by the public law of modern times; celebrated theologians were the first to write treatises on war, aiming to soften the savage rudeness of camps and to condemn their licentiousness; and from their works modern writers on military matters borrow many useful suggestions.

"The rule of the Papacy, which so often compelled Might to acknowledge the pre-eminence of Right, manifested in international relations its spiritualizing and pacifying influence. The Bull so often discussed, which at the end of the fifteenth century defined the boundaries of the immense discoveries of the Spaniards and Portuguese, was a confession made by the nations who demanded it that mere conquest did not suffice (to bestow the right of possession), and a petition, not for concessions which no one could grant, but for a sanction emanating from the highest representative of Right."

These truths, borrowed alike from authentic history and from the highest theological sources, are needful in our day, not only to the statesman, the diplomat, the legislator and enlightened politician, but to all who make the law their profession. If what was once Christendom has been divided by criminal political ambition and by false teaching, this has been due to the impious setting aside of the Papal authority; and if what remains of the once glorious unity is to be saved from the hands of the anti-Christian conspirators of our day, we must all labor to restore to the Papacy its practical

authority, its international influence, its independence, and all the salutary prerogatives of its mediatorial and judicial office.

The return of governments and nations to the old paths from which they have strayed must naturally be a slow one; but it has already begun. It is hard for proud and prosperous peoples to acknowledge that, in an evil hour, they wilfully closed their eyes to one of those fundamental social truths which are in the designs of the King of Kings to be beacon-lights for the guidance of humanity. But they are once more turning their faces toward the unquenchable radiance ever falling from the Seven Hills of Rome.

"A tribunal of public peace has been an object of desire during the last centuries to thinkers whose works are well known. This tribunal does not, indeed, exist at the present moment; but the wish that it should exist is more urgently, more frequently, expressed now than at any period in the past."

ARBITRATION, so often employed within the present century, is only a step, and it is a great one, toward the creation of the desired International Tribunal. M. Lacointa anticipates Count Kamarowsky's recital in a brief enumeration of the most remarkable acts of arbitration recorded, from the treaty concluded November 19th, 1794, between the United States and Great Britain, down to the *Alabama* arbitration.

He mentions the Senate Bill of June, 1886, authorizing the President of the United States to invite Mexico, together with all the states of Central and South America, to meet in Congress and discuss the best means of settling among themselves all differences that may arise.

"The successes attending the method of arbitration mark a decisive stage in the ascending march of law. The experience thus acquired attracts other states; not a year passes without the establishment of commissions or arbitration courts to solve questions the most diversified. The multiplicity of relations between peoples has made this development necessary."

A striking fact, mentioned by M. Lacointa, is that although there does not exist among sovereign and independent states any means of compelling the carrying out of an arbitral decision, nevertheless not one of the sentences thus pronounced has remained without complete fulfilment. Much, for instance, as Great Britain felt disappointed and aggrieved by the sentence of the arbitration court regarding the *Alabama* claims, that sentence was executed.

Another no less remarkable step on the road toward a peaceful settlement of international difficulties, is the custom now fairly established of introducing into all treaties what is known as the *compromissory clause*, the *compromissum* being the promise made by

each of the contracting parties to refer all differences arising about the interpretation or execution of the treaty to an arbitrator.

This led to the creating in Berne, the capital of the Swiss Confederacy, of *permanent offices*, whose business is to arbitrate in difficulties arising out of various branches of international activity.

The truth is that there is some danger of making too common a use of arbitration, which should only be invoked in difficulties of the most momentous kind. Still the bonds which are daily bringing more closely together the peoples most widely separated from each other by geographical space, by race, religion, and social institutions, multiply in every direction industrial activity, commercial and political relations, and increase in the same ratio the necessity of a well-developed and defined international jurisprudence. And, of course, the crowning of the edifice of international law must be a court to interpret and apply it.

We have only to remember how many additions have been made of late years to the legislation and institutions which are properly called international.

Our American authors have long been clamoring for the protection of an international copyright law, while our American publishers, who are a great money-power, are equally determined that our authors shall not have it. Such a law, putting authors on a footing of equality with their brethren in Europe, would be no small boon. Then there are international laws protecting industry and trade-marks; international postal conventions. And soon, some people hope, international telegraphs, railways, and other means of transport, will enjoy the protection of like common laws.

So, the more one reflects on this subject, the wider grows the prospect of close and manifold social and commercial relations between the inhabitants of our globe, the more also increases the conviction that all the dangers which threaten the peace of the world can only be effectively and permanently removed by the recognition of the mediatorial and arbitral authority of the Vicar on earth of Him who is the Judge of the whole earth.

"The Law of Nations exists, therefore," says M. Lacoïnta; "it is written in the treatises and works of publicists, or (and this is its first code) written in the conscience and the customs of generations. Its manifestations are frequent. Arbitrators, chosen by accident, apply it on various occasions. Without being supported by coercive means, their sentences are always executed. Why, then, should not a court, with a wider or narrower jurisdiction, be established to preside permanently over the execution of this law by the various states?"

Speaking of the agencies which have gradually and most powerfully so moulded public opinion as to make the peoples of both

hemispheres adverse to war and desirous of peaceful arbitration, M. Lacointa mentions, in the first place, the societies, unions, leagues, and friends of PEACE, who, under one form or one name or another, have been working so hard and so long to bring mankind to wish for *peace unbroken and perpetual*.

We, who have grown old with the century, can well remember how these "Friends of Peace" were laughed at as mere visionaries. They used to be looked down upon with somewhat of the same pity we extended to the Millerites and Millennium craze in general.

"When once you utter the word *chimæra*, *utopia*, all discussion becomes impossible, the case is ended, the verdict given in, and the idea is condemned. And this is so true that, fearful of being blamed as utopians, many persons will not even look at the pre-judged question. We all know what power there is in certain words. But are not hasty condemnations as arbitrary as blind prejudice or a foregone conclusion not to examine a question?"

"I am free to confess it," says M. Lacointa, "the creation of *an international tribunal* did appear to me as a *chimæra*, and, though strongly drawn to that order of studies, when I read Count Kamarowsky's book, I thought it a very rash production; and had it been in my power to do so, I should have willingly modified it.

"An attentive examination, meditation on the subject matter, have done away with that impression. The title is a bold one, no doubt, but it is no longer blame-worthy in my eyes. I see in it the formula of a just idea, which the future, which time, the incomparable master, can make a practical idea."

To the societies devoted to the pursuit of *international arbitration*, and their persevering efforts, the civilized world is indebted for this mode of settling difficulties between states. Both the British Parliament and the American Congress, after resisting the propositions made for adopting this solution, ended by approving it; our Congress declared this way of settling quarrels to be equitable and practical.

Charles Sumner, Richard Cobden, and Henry Richard, in their day, eloquently advocated it, while senates mocked and jeered. They were among the "visionaries." But their vision extended beyond the horizon and the mists which limited the intellectual forecast of the men who laughed at them.

These illustrious men, like the Mohammedans who erected the incomparable Mosque of Cordova and the scarcely less magnificent one of Seville, "buildd better than they knew." The Spanish Mussulman little fancied that he was constructing the most glorious of shrines for Christian worship when he reared these most beautiful edifices. And little dreamed Cobden or Sumner or so many others, in bringing each his stone and fashion-

ing it and fitting it into that scheme of International Arbitration, that they were building up for the Papacy a sanctuary of international justice destined to last for all time, and to confer on the human race blessings untold and un hoped for.

God works slowly through the ages, while elaborating anything which is to last forever. He is eternal and can bide His time. We Catholics know that His Church is also fated never to die. She can allow the wave of the present anti-Christian persecution to sweep by the rock on which she is seated, and the fierce tide of blasphemy and hate to cover her feet with its froth. Did not timid and short-sighted Christians in the days of Cromwell, as well as in those of Robespierre, believe that the Rock of Peter was shaken to its foundations, and was about to be rent and engulfed in the waves? Lo! the ocean-tides since then have encircled the earth, purifying and renovating it, destroying and overwhelming that only which was perishable or hurtful, and leaving the Rock of Peter more firm than the foundations of the earth, because reposing on the Truth of God's unfailing Promises.

The principle of an International Tribunal and of a permanent jurisdiction attached thereto is already an intellectual factor in the life of modern nations. More than one formidable obstacle will have to be overcome before the Pope can be universally accepted as the official mediator and arbitrator. But the currents of public opinion set in motion in the English speaking world alone will end in proposing or accepting the Pope in this capacity.

We may take as a sample of the opposition to be expected the insensate clamor raised in Canada at the present moment, about the last act of arbitration performed by the Holy See, the decision just given with regard to the indemnity offered by the Provincial Government of Quebec to the Catholic Church in that province for the Jesuit Estates which escheated to the crown in the year 1800.

A letter published in the Paris edition of the New York *Herald*, in the first days of March, and written from Montreal, represents the act of Leo XIII. as another "Papal aggression." It would be impossible to condense into as many lines as this letter contains a greater number of falsehoods, reckless misrepresentations, and unblushing perversions of fact. The tone and animus of the writer are those of the lowest and worst type of Orangemen, strikingly reminding us of what was written and published by the anti-Catholic press of Montreal in 1849-50, and what was uttered by the Orange leaders in the Canadian Parliament before and after the riots which led to the assault on the Governor-General, Lord Elgin, and on his Prime-Minister, Mr. Lafontaine, as well as to the burning down of the Parliament House and the destruction of the mag-

nificent library, with its manuscript treasures, an irreparable loss to the students of colonial history.

Then the cause assigned for the hostility to the Queen's representative, and the apology offered for the vandalism which spared not the Government buildings and attempted to set fire to Catholic churches and convents, was that Lord Elgin had given his signature to a bill indemnifying the French Canadians for losses endured during the short-lived flare-up called the Papineau rebellion. Some villages were ruthlessly and wantonly burned down, and the churches pillaged and destroyed by the British troops under General Gore. He, as the writer of this article can testify, was in sympathy with the rioters and incendiaries of 1849. It was his custom, in his drinking-bouts with his intimates, to use the consecrated chalice taken from one of the churches, that of St. Denis, if we mistake not.

Such was the *anti-Papist* spirit which resisted the very moderate indemnity granted to the injured Catholic Canadians in 1849 by a majority of the Provincial Parliament. And such is the same unhallowed and un-Christian spirit which still survives among the Orangemen all along the St. Lawrence, and which, after vainly protesting against the very moderate indemnity offered to the Canadian Church for the former Jesuit Estates, now resent and misrepresent as an act of Papal aggression or religious persecution the sentence pronounced by the Pope, in his quality of arbitrator chosen by the Government itself.

It was simply an act which concerned Catholics, the dispute being between the Jesuits on the one hand, who claimed the entire indemnity offered by the Government, and the Canadian Archbishops and Bishops on the other.

But the unjust and uncharitable spirit personified by Orangeism at home and abroad, will always end in discrediting the cause these fanatics advocate and which they still more disgrace by their acts of violence, outrage and bloodshed.

The excitement created in Lower and Upper Canada by the furious outcries of these Orangemen and the shameful countenance given to their unpatriotic and un-Christian conduct by some members, at least, of the Protestant Episcopal body, will not, we firmly believe, lead to a collision of creeds and races, to anything like the civil war now spoken of in the New York press.

Nor will the anti-Papal prejudices, still so strong, not only in Protestant lands and the Greek Empire, but in more than one nominally Catholic country, avail to block the march of ideas or to prevent the good sense of the human race from drawing logical conclusions from lofty and avowed principles, especially when the

dearest interests of humanity and the peace of the world are on the side of logic.

The prompt action of the Holy See when Germany and Spain invoked its *mediation*, and the no less prompt acceptance by both Governments of the proposed terms of agreement, made a deep impression in the diplomatic as well as in the industrial world. In a few weeks after the Pope had undertaken to examine the difficulty he had found for both nations an honorable way out of it; and the war-cloud which hung over Spain passed away like the mists of the morning.

We can take the judgment of the London *Spectator* on this speedy and uncostly issue to what threatened to be a serious international quarrel, as the judgment of sound common sense among the non-Catholic masses of Great Britain and the United States.

"Humanity is in search of an arbitrator of unquestionable impartiality;" so speaks the London journal. "Under many respects the Pope is, by his station, marked out for this office. He holds a rank which permits both monarchs and republics to have recourse to him without any sacrifice of their dignity. As a consequence of his mission, the Pope is not only impartial as between all nations, but he stands on such an elevation as to make their differences imperceptible to his eyes. There remains the question of religion; but this difficulty is growing daily less. No country could, in this respect, entertain greater prejudices than Germany. Well, Prince Bismarck consented to address himself to the head of the Roman Church. 'I shall not go to Canossa,' the Chancellor said; 'but if the Pope decides that our pretensions with regard to the Carolinas Islands are not just, I shall not contest with Spain the possession of the Carolinas.' Evidently the Carolinas are of very little importance to Prince Bismarck; but the fact that the proudest statesman on the Continent acknowledges before the world that he may, without loss of dignity, submit his conduct in an international transaction to the judgment of the Pope, is an extraordinary proof that the Pope still holds in our modern skeptical world an exceptional position. Without a territory, without soldiers, without revenues, without the right conferred by birth, without material forces, a Christian Pontiff is acknowledged by the master of armies to be his superior in one sense.

"Such a choice is not, after all, a triumph for material might and it tells us clearly that the Pope is, in certain cases, the actual arbitrator of the civilized world."

Long before 1885 and the incident of the Carolinas, as M. Lacointa remarks, Mr. David Urquhart, a Protestant like Prince Bismarck, addressed in 1869 to Pope Pius IX. a letter, "The appeal of a Protestant to the Pope for the restoration of the Public Law

of Nations." The appeal was in Latin, and was remarkable for its elevation of thought and its true eloquence.

" Might is an uncertain good," he says, " and glory is but vanity. That alone is powerful and durable which can supply a remedy for the diseases and aberrations of mankind.

" This is the power placed in your hands. Other power or hope there is none. I beseech you, most holy Father, that you call forth the lofty and all-pervading intelligence of the Roman Church for the purpose of cultivating this science (of International Law), which the ancients denominated the science concerned *about things human and divine*, and which made Pagan Rome so great, so noble and so venerable. This, also, depends on your power and good will.

" Come to the help of the wretched, who are alike unable to bear with or cure the evils they have brought on themselves. Come! I beseech you by your royal station, by your ancient title, by the memories of the past, by the Imperial City in which you dwell, by the very Latin tongue you make use of!"¹

This appeal was especially for the establishment in Rome of a great School of International Law as an auxiliary to the practice of the Roman Pontiff's mediatorial and judicial office. It was made while the Bishops of all Christendom were assembling for the Vatican Council, a spectacle which deeply impressed men of lofty intelligence and peace-loving, such as David Urquhart.

Two years before that, in 1867, Dr. Von Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence, urged and developed the necessity of such a school in Rome. After recalling the institutions of antiquity, the ancient constitutions of England and the Mussulman legislation already mentioned, he quoted the words of a petition addressed to the Pope eighteen years previously by a number of English Catholics. " We need such laws," they said, " in a society of virtuous citizens. Still, unless the Catholic Church raises her voice, these traditions will disappear in Europe, stifled by material interests, by the spirit of vain-glory, by a skepticism which keeps pace with immorality. The result would be a general confusion, followed by the chastisement of universal servitude."

The petitioners, therefore, besought the Pontiff to found in Rome,

¹ " *Anceps est potentia et gloria vana ; id tantum potens et durable quod remedium ad morbos et errores hominum afferat. Potentia illa tuis in manibus sita est. Potentia alia non est, necipes. Oro te, Beatissime pater, ut intelligentiam excelsam et undique permeantem Romanæ Ecclesiæ evoces ad istam scientiam colendam, ab antiquis de rebus humanis et divinis dictam, perquam Roma pagana magna, nobiles, et venexanda fuit. Hoc quoque apud potestatem et voluntatem tuam est. Miseris, qui mala se ipis illata nec tolerare nec sanare possunt, in auxilium venias, per dignitatem regiam, per antiquam titulum tuum, per præteriti memoriam, per Urbem sedem imperii quam incolis, per linguam ipsam qua uteres, oro.*"

beneath the protection of the Apostolic See, a college solely destined to teach international law and the true principles of social order.

This, be it said here, is one of the objects sought by M. Lacointa in editing the classic work of Count Kamarowsky. It has already been submitted to the Holy Father.

Now let us glance at the book of the noble Professor of International Law in the University of Moscow.

II.

The title itself is a bold one: "The International Tribunal." It tells the reader that such a tribunal either actually exists or is in a forward state of preparation. It leaves no room for thinking of mere theories or utopias. It suggests at once to the mind grand practical results, such as one expects from an international institution called to deal with the mighty issues of war, with the manifold interests of peace and its industries, and with the ever-increasing relations with each other of nations and continents, and the isles of the ocean.

The work is divided into four books, of which book first treats of "the means for ending the conflicts which arise between states"; book second recounts "the origin and history of the *idea* of an International Tribunal"; book third treats of the "theoretical development of the same idea"; the fourth and last deals with the "fundamental principles on which such a tribunal reposes."

Of course from a Russian, and one professing the creed of the Orthodox Greek Church, we are not to expect perfect conformity on doctrinal points with what the Catholic Church teaches. Still, one is pleased to find Count Kamarowsky give such definitions of international law and such statements of the great principles which underlie it as our best theologians and jurists would be disposed to quarrel with.

"International union," he says (that is, the union of nations between themselves), "although only dating from the beginning of modern history, continues to strike deeper and deeper roots into the relations of peoples and into science. The origin, the development, and the final aim of this union may be better understood by following the path of history. It has its essential foundation in the unity of the human race and is destined to bind together by juridical principles, into one superior whole, all states, the living members of humanity. The jurisprudence which springs from this union, and which has for its purpose this objective aim, is international jurisprudence. In itself the result of the historic life of humanity, this jurisprudence can only be understood by those who see in law not barren varieties and modifications of rules, of sta-

tutes or theoretical conceptions, but ever-living revelations of the sentiment of the race."

States, like private individuals, are moved by intellectual aberrations, by passions, by interest. The shock of these motive forces provokes armed conflicts. "To resist war and to restrain it by every possible means is the lofty mission of international law. Without law the peaceful and progressive development of humanity is impossible.

The author enumerates the general character of the trespasses committed against the law of nations by the nations themselves or by individuals for whom their respective governments are held responsible, as well as the methods of repairing the wrong thus done and of ending the difficulties and conflicts thence arising. Jurists differ in their classification of the means of solving such difficulties. This involves a brief survey of international procedure, and with this the author concludes his introduction to his work.

"A definite principle on which to base all such classifications," Count Kamarowsky says, "is found in the factors which determine and direct the life of nations. There are three of them: force, interests, and law or right. Each of these factors is related to a special category of the means of defence. On force repose coercive measures. Political and economical interests, being the principal objects of political action, lead men to the use of diplomatic means.

"These two means of redress were long the only ones thought of by peoples in defending themselves. Little by little law looms up as destined to replace both coercion and diplomacy in the future. It is growing up by their side and is elaborating purely juridical means of defence. To this tendency, we allow ourselves to hope, belongs the future. . . .

"*Force*, in a civilized society, is only called on to support law; from law alone it derives its efficiency, but its application should be confined within the limits marked by a wise policy. *Interests* form, in general, one of the principal elements in the formation and development of law. This, however, is not the only element. Another and a more important one is the moral element, emanating from the principle of justice, which is formed in the conscience of nations, under the influence of the moral and religious principles inherent in them."

These extracts prepare the reader for the course which the author intends to pursue, and gives a foretaste of the spirit which animates him in the discussion of the great theme he has undertaken.

We pass over the chapter which treats of the coercive measures resorted to for terminating international conflicts, to come to the

close of the next chapter, which deals at length with diplomatic measures. The author thus sums up what relates to these and to their efficacy in preventing wars, or in doing justice to aggrieved or wronged parties.

"We draw the following deductions: 1st. Mediation, as a political form of negotiating, is applicable to every kind of relations between states. It prepares the ground for a settlement, . . . but it presents no ready means of solution. Nor is any one of the states, partaking in such proceedings, held by any strict obligations. 2d. In our age . . . congresses appear as the organs of a collective mediation. . . . Publicists differ in their estimates of the value of congresses; some . . . look upon them as superfluous, or even mischievous; others . . . see in them the organs which give a voice to the general interests, and to the judicial convictions of the civilized world. 3d. Nevertheless, experience shows that congresses contribute very little toward the pacification of peoples, and the establishment of a common jurisprudence. . . . Then the great powers alone take part in them. Nor is it in the name of the general principles of law and justice, so dear to all, that these powers attempt to mediate, but to forward each its own narrow and selfish political interests. 4th. The strife thus essentially existing between these self-constituted mediators paralyzes all attempts at mediation, and prevents them from seeking the triumph of law. 5th. Conferences called for the purpose of mediating are devoid of the very first quality requisite toward that—impartiality."

So does the thesis developed by the author, step by step, tend to demonstrate the necessity of the mediator we know of.

The third chapter of this first book, which treats of the juridical means of pacification, is full of deep instruction for both statesman and student.

"RIGHT," he says, "*le droit*, is the law of coexistence of men in society. Its roots as well as its final purpose are found in the moral order which God has established. Contemporary jurisprudence places in the foreground the system of man's wants, and thereby explains the birth and development of right.

"But this manner of conceiving things is inadequate, for the sole reason that, in studying the juridical order, it contents itself with looking only at the outside.

"Right springs from two things particular to human nature; first, from the fact of man's being a *person*, . . . stamping with the seal of his *personality* all his relations toward others. Right springs from the peculiarities, bad and good alike, of human nature. Right, in the second place, springs from the *social nature* of man. For inasmuch as man is a *person*, he cannot live in isolation either physical

or spiritual. The ideas of personality and sociability derive reciprocally from each other, and support each other mutually. Therefore it is that the whole life of man is spent in *unions*.

"A special right (or jurisprudence), resulting from the life of such union, properly belongs to every kind of union or to every form of community.

"Thus has sprung up, not by the force of theoretical speculations, but by the very force of the needs of human life, and waxes still more vigorous, *the great community of states, or the International Union*. This Union has its own peculiar right or body of laws,—international right or law, which is that of humanity; and this law, although expressed only by some isolated members of the union, is created by the common life of the civilized world, until such time as it becomes the creation of the entire human race."¹

To jurists these extracts will convey some notion of the scientific precision with which Count Kamarowsky states his principles. To theologians and philosophers they indicate the solidity and elevation of his doctrine.

The second book traces the progress in history of this idea of an international tribunal. Even arbitration, the most perfect form of solving difficulties within states themselves or from one state to another, was not unknown in remote antiquity. After the death of Darius (486 B.C.), son of Hystaspes, a dispute arose between his sons, Xerxes and Ariamenes, which was ended by the sentence of their uncle, Artaphernes, as family judge or arbitrator. Xenophon also mentions that a dispute between Cyrus and the king of Assyria was submitted to the arbitration of one of the princes of India.

In the remotest ages religious authorities were mostly chosen as arbitrators. The Amphictyonic Councils in Greece, that of Delphi, and Pylos especially, judged all differences arising between the Grecian states. There the deputies of these states met twice annually. But the reverence with which the decisions of the Amphictyons were received in the best ages of Grecian liberty declined with that liberty itself, till, at length, the councils became a servile tool in the hands of Philip of Macedon.

Among the Romans, who aspired to universal domination, the only institution which had anything like the character of an international tribunal, was the *Recuperators*, courts organized occasionally in Rome to examine the claims of the subjects of foreign states, either against the Roman authorities or the citizens. Under the Republic, conventions were agreed upon between Rome and

¹ *Le Tribunal International*, pp. 103-105.

the provinces of Italy for the examining of such claims and granting redress. Later, like conventions were made with distant states or sovereigns, such as Carthage, Philip of Macedon, and King Antiochus.

The rules which guided these courts were a mixed code, made up of the Roman law and the laws of the foreign states concerned. They thus contained germs of international jurisprudence.

Coming to the Christian era and the Middle Ages, Count Kamarsowsky finds himself face to face with the Church and the salutary action of the Roman Pontiff. Here he is entirely misled by the prejudices of birth, education and creed, which so unhappily warp the intelligence of so many fair-minded Protestants among ourselves.

"The idea of an International Tribunal," he says, "manifests itself more distinctly, albeit in an original form, during the Middle Ages than in antiquity. It showed itself in that sphere where first sprang up in Europe a community between the nations, namely, in the sphere of religion. United by a common origin, the European peoples adopted almost simultaneously the Christian faith, and thereby acquired the resources of a new life, of a life superior both in its moral and social aspects.

"Personal arbitrary power, amid the rude manners of the epoch of the transmigration of the barbarian peoples, knew no limits; and there was hardly anything that could be called a central power. When, later, the Feudal order became established, the state had the character of a civil society, not of a political union. It was based upon private right, on the right of property and contract, and did not express the union of the people; because, instead of a people forming a whole, we meet anywhere with classes pursuing their own interests and enjoying independent rights.

"It is not to be wondered at, considering these conditions, that the Church took on herself, or received, outside of and beyond her direct and spiritual mission, the importance of a predominant social power. Many rights, belonging at bottom to the state, were placed in her hands, a condition of things useful in that epoch of anarchy. Thus it was that the Papacy, under the influence of circumstances, and thanks to the rare genius and energy of the Roman Pontiffs, arose and gained strength in western Europe. The Popes, during their period of power, from Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII., after an obstinate struggle of several centuries, looked upon themselves as the sovereigns of Europe.

"For a time the belief might have obtained that Theocracy had gained a final victory.

"The Popes claimed unlimited power, not only over men's bodies, but over their souls."¹

Of course no Catholic need be told that the Popes never put forth any such claim. The Church was, under God, the creator of the Christendom which arose on the ruins of the old Pagan world, and the veneration and gratitude of the peoples she had regenerated and moulded to civilization and Christian life attributed to their Mother all the authority and liberty which their filial love could bestow.

The Pope, the Vicar of Christ on earth, was the directing mind, the governing hand in the Church; who could claim over the nations the moral power which naturally, spontaneously, flowed from his divinely-appointed office? Peoples and kings gave to him willingly, lovingly, much more than he ever claimed. Read the life and writings of Pope St. Gregory the Great, and you will find in them the whole secret of the marvellous and salutary influence of the Papacy in the Middle Ages. It was that of Moses and Aaron leading the Twelve Tribes from degradation and bondage to freedom and nationality. It was that of Samuel ruling that nation within its own territory, standing between God and the people, and securing them against all temporal disasters so long as they listened to his voice and followed his guidance.

Well, Photius separated the East from the Holy See, broke up the unity of Christendom, subjected the Greek Church to the despotic yoke of the Byzantine emperors, and invited by the division and degeneracy thus created the Turks to destroy both Church and Empire. Has the Russian Church or the Russian people gained by setting aside, even in the social and international orders, the mediatorial offices and moral influence of Christ's Vicar?

Has Luther, by breaking up the unity of Western Christendom and substituting Henry VIII., Prince Bismarck or the Marquis of Salisbury for the Pope and his Legates in the Government of the Church, or the settling of domestic difficulties within states themselves, been less of a curse to humanity than his prototype, Photius?

Count Kamarowsky quotes, in support of his prejudiced assertions, the authority of the Protestant, Ward, who in 1795 published "An Inquiry into the Foundation and History of the Law of Nations in Europe." Not having the original English text, we translate from the French before us: "He who filled the Chair of Peter was to a certain point the master of Europe. In his quality of presumed mediator between heaven and earth, he decided who

¹ *Ibidem.*

was right and who was wrong; a great casuist when conflicts arose, he played toward kings, who recognized no tribunal above themselves, the rôle of censor and guardian of morals (*custos morum*).

"Thus was established a common tribunal for Europe in the circumstances in which it was most needed. The weak found a support in it; the powerful a restraint; the divinest of ideas, that of justice, could manifest itself freely, and the head of Christendom could, in very deed, be a personage worthy of his rank. This institution would have been excellent if the Popes had not made an ill use of their position, and if the imperfection of our nature had allowed the union, in the hands of one man, of wisdom and virtue in the necessary measure."

The translator of Count Kamarowsky's book, Mr. Sergius de Westman, a Russian himself and a distinguished diplomat, quotes in a foot-note a passage from Châteaubriand which not only refutes what is erroneous in the above passages, but completes the truth of the precious admissions of both the Russian professor and the English publicist.

"If one only takes a wider survey of the influence of Christianity on the political existence of the peoples of Europe, one cannot help seeing," says the illustrious Frenchman, "that religion saved them from famine, and saved our forefathers from their own mad passions, by proclaiming these truces called *the peace of God*, during which people gathered in their harvests and made their vintage. In the public troubles the Popes often showed themselves to be very great princes. They it was who, sounding the alarm, and organizing leagues, prevented Western Europe from becoming the prey of the Turks. This single service rendered by the Church to the world would deserve the raising of altars in her honor.

"Men undeserving of the name of Christians exterminated the native tribes of the New World, and the Court of Rome fulminated bulls to prevent such atrocities. Slavery was looked upon as legitimate; but the Church would acknowledge no slaves among her children. . . . Kings became more circumspect; they felt that there was a power able to control them, and that the people had in that power a protecting ægis. The Rescripts of the Pontiffs never failed to mingle the voice of nations and the general interests of mankind with the complaints addressed to individuals. '*We have heard that Philip, that Ferdinand, that Henry is oppressing his people*,' etc. . . . Such was the beginning of nearly all similar decrees of the Court of Rome."

But Châteaubriand has one paragraph which directly touches

on the central idea of Count Kamarowsky's work: "If there existed," he says, "in the midst of Europe a tribunal that could judge, in the name of God, nations and sovereigns, and which could prevent wars and revolutions,—this tribunal would be the masterpiece of political wisdom, and the last degree of social perfection. The Popes, by the influence which they exercised in the Christian world, were, for a moment, near realizing this beautiful dream."¹

Compare what Mr. Ward says above, in the passage we have underlined, of this Central Court or International Tribunal, and you will see how paltry are the objections raised by national or sectarian prejudice.

We must here take leave of Count Kamarowsky and his book. We believe that the idea which he has developed with such scientific skill and such deep conviction of the truth, the necessity, and the practicability of the institution he advocates, will bear its fruit in the not distant future.

We believe that the coming twentieth century will see in Rome, as a thing permanent and acknowledged by all nations, that International Tribunal, with the Papal authority as its central light, and side by side with the Pope, sovereign once more in his own city, will arise that College or School of International Jurisprudence which will furnish to the Pope, in the exercise of his mediatorial functions or of his office as supreme arbitrator, the counsellors and assessors who will help him to secure the peace of the world, and thereby to forward all the glorious interests of human industry and Christian civilization.

¹ Châteaubriand, *Génie du Christianisme*. See the chapter in vol. ii., entitled *Politique et Gouvernement*.

O'CONNELL'S CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, the Liberator. Edited, with Notices of His Life and Times, by W. J. Fitzpatrick, F.S.A., author of the "Life, Times, and Correspondence of Bishop Doyle;" "Life and Times of Lord Cloncurry," etc. Two volumes. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1888. For sale by the Catholic Publication Society, New York.

THAT "history repeats itself" is one of the tritest of sayings. Never, perhaps, has the truth of the saying been more strongly exemplified than by the recent publication of the correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, a correspondence that throws a flood of light on the times in which that great man lived, of which he formed so great a part, of the long and uphill fight he fought, of the forces and agencies against which he had to contend, and of the whole story of the Irish struggle from the day he took it in hand until the day he laid it down only at death's door.

To read the book, which has been edited by a master-hand, is, in its way, singularly like reading Ireland's story of to-day under her present political leader. Though the contrast between the genius and the characteristics of the two leaders, O'Connell and Parnell, is most marked, yet, in the main, we find Parnell following, whether consciously or not, very closely in the lines marked out and invented by O'Connell. The difference between the two is rather one of position and of time than of method. O'Connell was compelled to take up single-handed what seemed a hopeless fight against all the prejudices and traditions, the order and regulations, of the most powerful empire of his time. At the beginning of the battle—of the war, rather—he had no following at his back save the heart of the Irish people, and that heart never failed him. A giant in intellect as in physique, a man on whom the Almighty had bestowed every quality and qualification needed to sustain him in his gigantic struggle, he succeeded in breaking down, not by a rush or lucky assault, but by the most skilful and calculated generalship, the barriers of centuries, the rooted bulwarks of systematized tyranny, oppression, resistance to the will of the people, and denial of civil and religious liberty to the Irish people in fact, but to all peoples in principle. It was he who opened the breach through which Parnell and his followers are marching to victory to-day. It was he who laid the true plan of campaign that is winning over

England to-day to the Irish cause. It was he who, to adapt a phrase of the great Napoleon, found the crown of Ireland in the mire, and, picking it up, placed it, not on his own head, but on the head to which it belonged—the nation's. For it is plain from this correspondence that O'Connell was a republican by conviction, and regarded the government of the United States as the best of human governments. "You ask me," he writes to Sir Henry Jervis, of Wexford, an officer in the Royal Navy, who had addressed O'Connell in the bluff style of an old sailor, "who are to be understood as THE PEOPLE, the source of legitimate power." And here is his answer :

"I reply. All those not possessed of prerogative or privileged capacities. *Not* the king in his corporate capacity,—*not* the peers in their privileged state,—but all those who are neither king nor peers. In short, the Commons, for whose benefit the king *ought* to reign, and for whose benefit alone the privileges of the peers *ought* to exist. . . .

"You presume to talk to me of the 'dregs' of the people. Whom do you dare to call amongst the people by the abusive epithet of 'dregs?' Not the rich and the titled, I warrant, but the laborious and the poor. Now, as to the poor and laboring classes, I will not allow you to claim any superiority over them. You thought fit to bestow your tediousness on me for a long half-hour, during which you condescended to exhibit to me your views on various local and general topics, and I can confidently assert that I have frequently received in five minutes, from one of the poor and laboring classes, more information and more sound views of public policy than I did from you in your entire half-hour.

"Again, sir, you presume to assail the spirit of democratic liberty—the only rational spirit of freedom—by calling a democracy 'the worst, the most brutal, and senseless of tyrannies.' How ignorant you must be of the first elements of political history, and how utterly blind to the scenes that are passing before your eyes.

"What country in the world is it in which the national debt is on the verge of inevitable extinction; in which taxation is on the point of being reduced to the lowest possible quantity; in which peace reigns within its borders; in which abundance crowns the labors of the fields; in which commerce and domestic industry flourish and increase; in which individual happiness rewards the private virtue and enterprise of the citizens; and which, in fine, is as honored abroad as it is prosperous at home?

"What state is thus respected by foreign powers, and thus happy in its internal relations? It is a democracy—a democracy without one single admixture of monarchial or aristocratical principle—America."

Here, indeed, spoke a true tribune of the people. How far O'Connell's estimate, how far his prescience fell above or below the reality and the innate strength of this democratic power and people, may be left to the judgment of the reader. It should be remembered that he wrote that letter in 1834, when as yet the Republic of the United States was an infant, though a giant infant, among the nations and the powers of the world. At that time the gold-fields of California were not dreamed of, nor the cruel famine that created the Irish exodus to this country and broke the heart of O'Connell. Little did even he dream of the mighty growth that would spring from that famine. If ever there was need of conversion, the result of the Irish exodus was most surely to convert the Republic of the United States to the Irish cause; at a time, too, when the Republic ranks foremost among the foremost powers of the world.

It will be seen, from the letter quoted, that O'Connell, when dealing with an adversary, did not mince his words. He never minced them nor his meaning. It is said of him, even by admirers, that at times he was coarse in his language. Very possibly he was; but he had constantly to deal with base assailants on whom the refined amenities of attack and retort would have been wasted. His heart was warm in the fullest sense; and his mind followed rather than guided, the impulse of his heart. For personal enemies he cared nothing and had no enmity against them; but against enemies of "the cause, the cause, the sacred cause," as he was constantly exclaiming of Ireland, he was a lion, who sprang with a lion's spring, roared with a lion's roar, and struck with a lion's paw. Between the ebullient passion of O'Connell and the frozen passion of Parnell there is a world of contrast; yet underneath the surface the same fire burned.

Yes, and both had the same forces to contend against; enemies from within—spies, traitors, fanatics in the camp—as well as the host of enemies from without. Precisely the same forces, precisely the same agencies, were set at work and utilized by the English Government against O'Connell as against Parnell and his party to-day. There was coercion; there was bribery and corruption; there was abuse of the judicial power and packing of the juries; there was incitement to the people to revolt in order to justify the tyranny of the government; there was subordination of the press—the *London Times* appears frequently in O'Connell's correspondence in exactly the same sense as it has recently figured against Parnell; there were appeals to strong fanaticism; there were secret appeals to Rome to smite the arm of the Liberator; there were in England men whom O'Connell characteristically describes as "crawling Cawtholics"; there were in

Ireland some, though not many, "Crown priests," and a few ultra-cautious prelates; and there were the various secret societies which O'Connell dreaded most of all and which he regarded from first to last as the most dangerous enemies of Ireland and the greatest obstacles to the restoration of her liberties. How wise he was in this is sufficiently illustrated by the disclosures made by spies and informers before the Commission appointed to adjudicate on the "Parnellism and Crime" charges of the *London Times*. Add to this a series of inefficient Irish Viceroys and brutal Irish Secretaries, an army of military and police to suppress Irish patriotism, courts constituted to convict Irish patriots; and some faint conception may be formed of what this one man accomplished in the way of Irish independence. Truly may it be said of him that he not only created a policy and a party, but he resurrected a nation. He was the Moses of his people. He was their law-giver. He it was who broke the bondage under which they had so long suffered; who led them and upheld them in the weary and disheartening journey through the desert of despondency and despair; and who died at last without even a glimpse of the promised land.

"Whoever," says Lecky, the historian, "turns over the magazines or newspapers of the period, must at once perceive how grandly O'Connell's figure dominated in politics—how completely he had dispelled the indifference that had so long prevailed on Irish questions—how clearly his agitation stands forth as the great event of the time." Greville, who was certainly English enough, and who knew courts and cabinets to the core, says in his "Memoirs": "History will speak of him as one of the most remarkable men who ever existed; he will fill a great space in its pages; his position was unique: there never was before, and there never will be again, anything at all resembling it." He attained to such a power that he made and unmade cabinets and ministries in England. He was more dreaded than a hostile army. His name and the principles which he advocated spread throughout Europe, throughout the civilized world, and lit the flame of freedom in every oppressed land. The crushed Catholics of France took fire from his teaching, and the founders of the *Avenir*, De Lammenais, Montalembert, Lacordaire, Ozanam, fairly worshipped him, and taking heart from his example, forced liberty of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, freedom of Christian education, from a reluctant atheistical government. Pope Pius IX. paid one of the highest tributes to his character and genius as a statesman. The celebrated Father Ventura delivered one of the most eloquent panegyrics on him. The range of his power and influence was not confined to the British Empire, but extended far beyond. Though his heart throbbed first and always for the restoration of

the liberties and self-government of Ireland, that heart embraced in its scope all oppressed peoples and turned against all tyrannical governments. His was a colossal vigor, and all who suffered under injustice looked to him for inspiration and guidance. His force as a statesman was not national alone; it was international; and his name is deservedly a word to conjure with in Ireland to this day, as it will be to all future time; so long, at least, as Ireland is peopled by the Irish. In Ireland's history thus far, two great figures stand forth pre-eminently: the one, the Apostle; the other, the Liberator of Ireland. St. Patrick drew the people out of the darkness of Paganism; O'Connell drew them out of the darkness of despotism.

The life of O'Connell is sufficiently known to all students of English and Irish history. Many biographies of him have appeared and many works by various authors in which he was made the central figure. Indeed, it is impossible to read the history, more especially the political history, of his time without finding the name and the presence of O'Connell on almost every page. In English politics he was the Warwick of his day: the king-maker, so far as the king's cabinet went. In Irish politics he was the Alpha and Omega; so history must deal with him. But here for the first time we have his own story as told by himself in his letters to his family, his friends, his foes, his acquaintances; literally the story of his life from day to day, dashed off in the hurry of the few moments he could snatch from a multitude and tangle of cares and occupations that would be overwhelming to most men even of extraordinary capacity and business ability. On they pour: a constant torrent leaping from the great heart and mind and illustrating every phase of the simple yet many-sided character of the man, illustrating also the history of the times. But through all, whether it be a loving message to his wife, to his children, a joyous or despondent letter to a friend, an appeal or rebuke to a political opponent, a communication to the press, a rollicking snack of the gossip of the hour, an exposition of a plan of action, a warning here, an exhortation there, a jubilant note or a wail of woe, there runs the same tone of a man with a fixed and great purpose, of a great heart, and none can read these letters, the outpourings of his inner soul, without feeling the beatings and the throbings of that heart which was invincible until it broke on what he thought to be the grave of his country.

Nowhere does a man reveal himself so thoroughly as in the letters which, admirably collated and annotated, form the bulk of these volumes. Most of the letters were not intended for publication; and those which were intended for publication were written for the press of the day. Those, however, who would study

O'Connell will study him at his best here. He was born in August, 1775, at Carhen, near Cahirciveen, County Kerry. He died in Genoa on his way to Rome in May, 1847. His life embraces a period of seventy-two years. His education began at Cove, near Cork. Thence, owing to the restriction placed on Catholic education by the English government, he was sent to St. Omer and afterwards to Douay. While in France he witnessed the outbreak of the first French revolution, and the horrors attending it left an indelible impression on his mind. The correspondence begins with letters from St. Omer "written in the large hand of a child." The child's letters are those of any college boy, but display a dutiful spirit and affectionate heart. The correspondence ends with O'Connell's departure for the Rome he never lived to reach.

In January, 1793, the boy, who was then eighteen years of age, wrote to his uncle Maurice from Douay, that "the present state of affairs in this country is truly alarming; the conduct the English have pursued with regard to the French in England makes us dread to be turned off every day. In case of a war with England this is almost inevitable." Uncle Maurice, who paid for the education of his nephews, immediately ordered them home on the receipt of this news. A John Sheares, who was afterwards hanged in the Irish rebellion of 1798, accompanied the boys from Calais to Dover. Sheares shocked O'Connell by exultingly exhibiting a handkerchief which he had soaked in the blood of Louis XVI. as it flowed from the scaffold. O'Connell was horrified at the acts of the Revolutionists and left France almost a Tory at heart, as he often said. When the English packet boat on which he sailed had got under way he tore the tricolor cockade, worn for safety at the time in France, into the sea. "Some French fishermen, rowing past, cursed him," says Mr. Fitzpatrick, "as they reverently rescued the cockade." Such was one of the opening incidents in the dawning manhood of the author of the "bloodless revolution" which to the last he advocated, and which has been so wisely and effectively taken up by his successor to-day.

The story of the struggle for Catholic emancipation needs no re-telling here. It has long since gone into history as one of the greatest of political achievements in the face of what at the time were considered insurmountable obstacles. In order to emancipate a nation in the sense of recovering for it what, after all, was at the time but partial religious freedom, O'Connell had to conquer a nation more powerful than imperial Rome in her palmy days. He had to educate, not the English mind alone, but the Irish mind also. For Ireland had been so long under the ban and walking in the valley of the shadow of death, that the people had lost heart, or whatever heart was left to them found expression in

the abortive attempts of casual secret societies, which accomplished nothing, save to give excuse for the hand of the enemy pressing heavier on the unhappy land. It was his great ambition and achievement to organize the people and infuse his own heart, soul and intelligence into them. Nor in his purpose, terrible as he was in battle and volcanic in his wrath when thoroughly aroused, did he discriminate between the orange and the green. It was his wish from first to last to blend the colors into a national wreath to set upon the brow of Erin. If he failed in this magnanimous and patriotic desire, the fault of the failure lay neither with him nor with those, both Catholic and Protestant, who followed his lead and inspiration.

"In 1800," says the editor, "O'Connell opposed the Union, and the day-dream of his life was its repeal. This was sternly demanded in 1810 by the Dublin Corporation, then held by ultra-Tories; and O'Connell hailed with joy the probable junction of orange and green." In the January of that year, O'Connell writes to Sir James Riddall, the High Sheriff of Dublin: "I entertain a very strong and, I will add, a very grateful sense of that patriotic zeal which instigates you to bring together your countrymen of every persuasion upon every occasion in your power. Believe me, I should feel sincere pleasure in any efforts of mine, however humble, to co-operate in the desirable result of combining all classes in mutual affection and in the common defence of our common country."

Here is struck the key-note of O'Connell's entire political career; reconciliation, friendship, unity among all classes, castes and persuasions; equal civil and religious liberty for all; the two nations enjoying equal rights and privileges under the one crown. O'Connell constantly repudiated the idea of separation or dismemberment of the British Empire, which, then, as now, was raised up, and with a like success, for the purpose of disorganizing the Liberal forces in England whom O'Connell had won over to the Irish cause, and of inflaming the passions of the Orangemen in Ireland.

It was in 1805 that O'Connell took a lead in the Roman Catholic party of action, which was formed to force the Catholic claims on the English Parliament. Pitt, Fox, Grattan, and the old Catholic leader, Keogh, desired that the question be held in abeyance. The action at this stage of proceedings only amounted to a petition to Parliament, presenting the claims. The old-school Catholics, under the advice of their few Liberal, or Whig, as the term then was, friends in Parliament were fearful of taking even that mild step. Not so O'Connell. His mind, even thus early, was doubtless wholly clear and fully made up as to the line of action to be pursued in order to fight the English government, though

probably even he had not yet dreamed of hewing his way into the English Parliament. The attempt was at once made on the part of the government to attach an air of treason to the proceedings of the Catholic body and its committee. Mr. Pole stated in Parliament that "if gentlemen would read the debates of the Catholic Committee, they would find separation openly and distinctly recommended." O'Connell, at a meeting held in Dublin, in February, 1812, replied: "Why, this is a direct accusation of high treason, and he who would assert it of me I would brand with the foulest epithets. I defy the slightest proofs to be given of its veracity."

O'Connell was already making himself felt in England as well as in Ireland. In Ireland he was the advocate of advocates, and could win over even a hostile jury in spite of itself and of all the ill-used power of the authorities. He came to be known as "*the Counsellor*," there only being one such in all Ireland. While pursuing his professional duties with extraordinary ardor and success, pecuniarily and professionally, he was organizing the Catholic agitation throughout the country with such effect that the government began to take alarm and set its engines and agents at work to break or mar the agitation. Sir Arthur Wellesley writes (Nov. 17th, 1808) from London to Dublin Castle: "I think that as there are some interesting Catholic questions afloat just now, you might feed — with another £100." So much for him who was afterwards known as "the Great Duke," and whom O'Connell detested for his persistent hostility to Irish claims. Corruption was abroad. Resort was had to the revival of penal measures which it was thought had become dead letters. Anything to break up the Catholic agitation, as though it were a crime and a treason for a Catholic to claim his civil and religious rights, to avow and practise his religion, and to claim his place in and under a government professing to be the freest under the sun.

A proclamation was issued from Dublin Castle, in Feb., 1811, requiring every sheriff and magistrate throughout Ireland to arrest all persons connected either actively or passively "in the late elections for members or delegates to the General Committee of the Catholics of Ireland." As a consequence, Lord Fingall, the ostensible head of the movement, was arrested, together with several of his colleagues, and the movement was for the time being arrested with them, the year 1814 closing in gloom "as regards the political prospects of the Catholics," writes O'Connell's son, John. Delegation was destroyed; but O'Connell, who justly boasted that he could drive a coach and six through any act of Parliament, kept the agitation alive by holding meetings for the purpose of preparing petitions to Parliament.

O'Connell had now become such a force in political life that it was determined to destroy him at any cost. The government rightly recognized in him a born and trained leader of the people, in their eyes a most skilful and dangerous revolutionist. Nothing could terrify him, and he was so thorough a lawyer that he could not be entrapped. Those were dueling days, and challenges he received in abundance, for, as said already, he never minced his words, and his words struck home. In 1815 occurred the famous duel with D'Esterre, a member of the Dublin Corporation, and noted for his nerve and knowledge of the use of arms. He actually forced the duel on O'Connell and was killed for his pains. All the details of the duel tend to show that the authorities took more than a friendly interest in D'Esterre's action, the fatal result of which was a life-long sorrow to O'Connell, who atoned as best he could by greatly befriending D'Esterre's family afterwards.

D'Esterre was by no means the only man who called O'Connell out, nor was he the only man whom O'Connell offered to meet. Between O'Connell, Peel and Stanley, who were in turn chief secretaries for Ireland and who exercised that office in much the same spirit that Mr. Balfour exercises it to-day, there was a settled hostility. Both of those statesmen scored against O'Connell heavily at times, but on the whole he was more than a match for both, and on one occasion he so stung Peel, who was at the time chief secretary, that the latter sent him a challenge, and a meeting was arranged for on the Continent. Rumors of the affair got abroad. Both men were ready for the fray. O'Connell reached London in safety; but the authorities being on the watch he was arrested when stepping into a chaise for Dover, and there was the end of the affair, the collisions of the two statesmen being afterwards confined to parliamentary warfare in the clash of debate. His affair with Disraeli, whom he had so strongly befriended when the future Tory premier of England was entering on his political career as a Radical, is notorious. But by that time O'Connell had very wisely and properly got over his duelling propensities. He could afford to disregard such challenges, and he did so on the highest ground, that duelling was an offense not only against the law of the land, but against the divine law. Later on Disraeli, who turned on Peel just as he had turned on O'Connell, found cause bitterly to rue his treacherous attacks on the Irish chief. In an election in 1835, on the result of which the safety of the Tory administration largely depended, the Tories were badly beaten, mainly through O'Connell's influence. "Henry Stanley," wrote Disraeli, "who had promised me to vote for Sutton, voted for Abercromby. O'Connell is so powerful that he says he will be in the cabinet. It is the Irish Catholic party that has

done all the mischief." And to drop the duelling episodes, here is a characteristic description by O'Connell himself of a duel in which a relative of his was one of the principals: Writing to his son, Morgan, he asks: "Did you hear of the great duel in Ennis between Charles O'Connell and Mr. Wall? The latter abused a relation of Charley's, a Mr. Blood, and Charley knocked Wall down. They then fought, fired a shot each, came home safe and arm-in-arm together, got tipsy in company with each other, went together to the ball and danced till morning."

Strange, indeed, it seems, now that the victory has been long since won, to reflect on the blind obstinacy and malignant stupidity with which the English government and crown fought the granting of the natural and divine right of religious freedom to the Catholics. The opposing governments were, in the main, Tory, for the Whigs, whether from motives of policy or conscience, once the cry and agitation for Catholic emancipation were systematically raised, took up the cry and soon allied themselves with O'Connell, timid as they were at the beginning of the struggle. Stanley, afterwards Lord Derby, and who succeeded Peel in the leadership of the Tories, with the ex-Radical Disraeli as his crafty lieutenant, on being charged later on with deserting his Tory colors, made the flippant answer: "Anything to dish the Whigs." Possibly at the time when O'Connell had aroused his countrymen to the sense of no longer waiting, but creating and shaping, circumstances to their own favor and necessities, the thought of the Whigs in joining him was anything to beat the Tories, who were then all-powerful, and who resisted as strenuously electoral reform in England as reform of any kind in Ireland. It has been said of the Bourbons that "they never learn, and never forget." That saying precisely characterizes the Tories of the present as of the past. The Wellingtons, the Peels, the Stanleys, and their followers of the earlier part of the century, are but earlier editions of the Salisburys and Balfours of to-day, at all events in their policy towards Ireland. Disraeli was the only Tory leader who could boast with justice that he had "educated up" his party to some measure of liberal ideas. Salisbury has fallen back on the old Tory tracks, the old Tory methods, the old Tory deceits, and the old Tory contempt for public opinion, which in the end will surely overwhelm him and his party.

Some of the Crown lawyers proposed that the King should exercise a veto in the appointment of Catholic bishops, who were few enough and far enough between. To O'Connell's grief, Gratian, then in the English Parliament, and whose glory had not yet gone out, joined the vetoists, notwithstanding that, Protestant as he was, he had been one of the most eloquent advocates of Catholic

emancipation. O'Connell expressed his astonishment at this defection in a touching yet emphatic manner, which gave such offence to the then aging Grattan that in 1815 he declined to take charge of the petition for emancipation. That was bad enough in its way, but it was a still greater shock to find Dr. Murray, the future Archbishop of Dublin, two years later supporting the veto. Dr. Murray, an extremely cautious prelate, between whom and Dr. MacHale, the famous Archbishop of Tuam, occurred many a tilt later on regarding Irish national affairs, was what in these days would be described as a "Castle Bishop." Furthermore the Tories then as now had been working on Rome, such a Rome as under the sway of Bonaparte was allowed to exist, to use its influence against the Irish national movement. The Pope was a captive in the hands of Napoleon, and during his imprisonment Monsignor, afterwards Cardinal, Quarantotti acted as the Pope's vicegerent. In 1814 Mgr. Quarantotti addressed a rescript to Dr. Poynter, the bishop of the London district, conceding the veto. But then, as now, there were prelates in Ireland who, perfectly acquainted with the situation, were not afraid to speak their minds. "The result of this pernicious avowment," wrote Dr. O'Shaughnessy, Bishop of Killaloe, "if acted upon, would be fatal to the Catholic religion; therefore I hasten to protest against it, and while I have breath in my body will continue to do so." And Dr. Coppinger, Bishop of Cloyne, described the rescript as "a very dangerous document," adding: "In common with every real friend to the integrity of the Catholic religion in Ireland, I read it with feelings of disgust and indignation."

Dr. Murray, who was assistant with right of succession to Archbishop Troy, had previously compared the vetoists to Judas. "As to Dr. Troy," writes O'Connell, "better could not be expected from him. His traffic at the Castle is long notorious. . . . You cannot conceive anything more lively than the abhorrence of these vetoistical plans amongst the people at large. I really think they will go near to desert all such clergymen as do not now take an active part on the question. The Methodists were never in so fair a way of making converts." O'Connell afterwards came to esteem Archbishop Murray as a man "peculiarly formed to conquer prejudice and abash calumny." The Knight of Kerry, prominent in social and political circles at the time, took charge of the Catholic petition which Grattan had dropped, and it is interesting to note that he was ably assisted by Sir Henry Parnell.

To go into the details of the movement for Catholic emancipation, as given in this correspondence, would in itself consume an article. The letters bearing on it, however, form most instructive and interesting reading. It is enough to say that through all O'Connell was most firm and loyal to the faith. He would have

no compromise in the matter. In 1821 Mr. Plunkett, a prominent Irish member, but of course not a Catholic, for Catholics were not then eligible to a seat in Parliament, introduced an unsatisfactory Catholic Relief Bill, for the third reading of which two hundred and sixteen members voted against one hundred and ninety-seven. Lord Eldon opposed the Bill in the House of Lords "on account of the danger with which it threatened the State." Much to O'Connell's delight this "rascally Catholic bill," as he called it, was thrown out.

In 1825 a "Bill to Suppress the Catholic Association" was introduced in the House of Commons, and Shiel and O'Connell were sent as a deputation to argue the case as counsel at the bar of the House. Their arrival in England excited much curiosity, and they were received with distinction everywhere. O'Connell's letters at this time, his impressions of the House (in which he was to become so great a figure), of the English people, of the English leaders and notables, are as racy as could be. He utilized his opportunity to work upon the feelings and intelligence of the English people, much as Parnell, in one of his strong speeches, appealed from the judgment of a hostile Tory Ministry to "the great heart of England." O'Connell's gigantic figure and noble countenance and bearing attracted the attention and admiration of all. An amusing incident occurred at Wolverhampton, where they arrived with whetted appetites in early morning. It was Lent, and there was a profusion of everything but Lenten fare. Their eyes lingered longingly on what Shiel calls "an unhallowed round of beef, which seemed to have been placed on the breakfast table to lead us into temptation." But O'Connell, who, as the correspondence shows, was most observant of all his religious duties, exclaimed: "Recollect that you are in sacred precincts; the terror of the Vetoists has made Wolverhampton holy." The "terror of the Vetoists" was the venerable and illustrious Bishop Milner, who, in the face of the majority of his fellow-Catholic countrymen, and to his own great personal suffering, stood out so nobly against the Veto.

O'Connell was lionized wherever he went. Dr. Bathurst, the Protestant Bishop of Norwich, and, to his honor, an ardent advocate of Catholic emancipation, sent Sir Henry Parnell to ask O'Connell to honor him with a visit. O'Connell complied, and "a fine, lively old gentleman he is," wrote O'Connell to his "darling Heart," one of the multitude of endearing titles he has for his wife. "He is full of anxiety for Catholic emancipation, and I pray God he may live to be a Catholic himself." Singularly enough, by God's grace, the Bishop's son and daughter were converted to the Catholic faith.

O'Connell had great hopes of the success of this mission.

"Darling, darling," he writes in his customary fashion to his wife, "since I wrote the word 'free' I have been under examination (before the Committee of the House of Commons). Call my children together; tell Danny (his youngest son) to fling up his cap for old Ireland. I have now no doubt but that we shall be emancipated." How the man's heart burns within him with zeal for the cause and love for his wife and family. Such ebullitions constantly occur; and, on the other hand, his dejection when things went ill was just as mournfully expressed. At such moments his heart was an Æolian harp, swung by the breeze of events, and giving out its soul and its sorrow in the saddest yet most beautiful music.

O'Connell's hopes were rudely broken. The Duke of York, then heir apparent to the throne, whom O'Connell thought he had won over, rose in the House of Lords, presented petitions against Emancipation, recalled his father's "conscientious antagonism" to it, and declared that in whatever situation in life he might be placed, he would adhere to the principles thus enunciated, "so help me God!" The mission was a failure save in so far as helping to enlighten the English mind on the real and great grievances and disabilities under which the Catholic people of Ireland suffered. Ireland a little later contained a population of nine millions, the vast majority of whom were Catholics. How sadly that fine population has been depleted is known; but the depletion, sad as it is, has at least had one providential result, in spreading the Irish race and propagating it over all civilized lands, and raising up a new Ireland wherever the martyr seed fell, especially on the soil of English speaking peoples.

O'Connell went back to Ireland, empty-handed it is true, but more determined than ever to wring emancipation out of the heart of the Government. At last he made the resolve to cut the Gordian knot with the sword of Alexander. The Clare election came on, and in a stirring appeal, written off-hand, to his fellow-countrymen, he asked their votes to elect him as their representative to Parliament. Here is how he put the case as against Sir Vesey Fitzgerald, who was considered to own the county:

"You will be told I am not qualified to be elected; the assertion, my friends, is untrue. I am qualified to be elected, and to be your representative. It is true that as a Catholic I cannot, and of course never will, take the oaths at present prescribed to members of Parliament; but the authority which created these oaths—the Parliament—can abrogate them; and I entertain a confident hope that, if you elect me, the most bigoted of our enemies will see the necessity of removing from the chosen representative of the people

an obstacle which would prevent him from doing his duty to his King and to his country.

"The oath at present required by law is: 'That the sacrifice of the Mass, and the invocation of the blessed Virgin Mary and other Saints, as now practised in the Church of Rome, are impious and idolatrous.' Of course I will never stain my soul with such an oath. I leave that to my honorable opponent, Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald. He has often taken that horrible oath; he is ready to take it again, and asks your votes to enable him to swear. I would rather be torn limb from limb than take it. Electors of the county Clare, choose between me, who abominate that oath, and Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald, who has sworn it full twenty times! Return me to Parliament, and it is probable that such a blasphemous oath will be abolished forever."

Here at last was the gauntlet thrown down. Petition and appeal, which had proved profitless, yielded to an open declaration of war. The Government was astounded and amazed, as was the entire kingdom. They were challenged on the lines of the English Constitution, and they shrank from the challenge; for O'Connell in his address declared that if returned he would "vote for every measure favorable to radical reform in the representative system, so that the House of Commons may truly, as our Catholic ancestors intended it should do, represent all the people." He called for "a more equal distribution of the overgrown wealth of the Established Church in Ireland, so that the surplus may be restored to the sustentation of the poor, the aged, and the infirm." It is said of some men that they are in advance of their time. That is often true, and it was very true in O'Connell's case. But such men drop seeds which fructify in after-time, though the man who sowed them may be forgotten. Ireland had to wait for Mr. Gladstone's disestablishment of the Irish church—that "deadly upas tree," as he called it—to see O'Connell's idea carried out. In the same address he avowed his purpose to bring "the question of the repeal of the Union, at the earliest possible period, before the consideration of the legislature." Well might Lecky say that emancipation was won by "the unaided genius of a single man." Repeal of the Union was O'Connell's expression for the Home Rule demand of to-day.

His countrymen rallied to their leader. Fitzgerald, with all his local influence and all the power of the government at his back, was beaten in such a manner as to indicate to the government that a new Ireland had arisen under a new leader. "Years after," says the editor of the correspondence, "Peel admitted that he was perfectly overwhelmed" by O'Connell's victory.

And with reason was he overwhelmed. For it was not the

Premier or the Tory Government that was now on trial before the eyes of England and the world, but the English Constitution and England's pretensions to be a true representative government. The Clare election secured Catholic Emancipation, Peel being compelled to introduce the Bill, and the Act of Emancipation received a most reluctant "royal" assent on April 13th, 1829. Through what ages of untold suffering and sorrow had Ireland to wait for this act of simple justice!

O'Connell was elected in 1828, but he never occupied his seat until the passing of the Emancipation Act. Then came the memorable scene in the House of Commons. Stupid and bigoted to the last, the majority of the House decided that O'Connell could not take his seat unless he took the oath obligatory on all members at the time of his election, the oath which he had declared he would rather be torn limb from limb than take. When introduced into the House, the excitement, we are told, was intense, and expressed itself in a breathless silence among the packed assembly. The Speaker called upon him to take the oath. He asked to see it, and on its being handed to him he read it carefully, though of course he knew it by heart. Then rang out in that silent assembly of England's legislators the immortal utterance: "I see in this oath one assertion as to a matter of fact which I *know* to be false. I see in it another assertion as to a matter of opinion which I *believe* to be untrue. I therefore refuse to take that oath," and, as Mr. Richard O'Connell, B. L., an eye-witness of the scene, says, "with an expression of the most profound contempt, he flung the card from him on the table of the House." "The House," says the same witness, "was literally 'struck of a heap.' No other phrase that I know of but that quaint, old-fashioned one can accurately describe the feeling of amazement that pervaded Parliament for some minutes after the card was thus contemptuously flung on the table." Naturally; for it was the sound of the tocsin of civil and religious liberty, not alone in England, but in the very midst of England's Senate and in the halls of England's legislature.

O'Connell, refusing to take the abominable oath, was refused his seat, and a new writ was issued for Clare only to result in a re-election. The Gordian Knot that barred the religious liberty of a people was cut in twain. There was an end of the oath, and O'Connell entered Parliament as its foremost man. Incidentally, while the fight over his admission was still being waged, he writes to a friend in London: "Have you heard of the conduct of the English Catholics towards me? They have a club here called the 'Cis-Alpine,' a bad name, you will say. They had been much divided amongst themselves, and were now about all to reunite.

I agreed to be proposed into it, when, behold! they met the day before yesterday and *black-beaned* me.

"However, I believe it has knocked up the club, as Howard, of Carby, and several others at once declared that they would never again come near it.

"Mr. Blount has behaved exceedingly well on this occasion; no man could behave better. I believe there are many of them highly indignant at the conduct of the rest; and, at all events, I heartily forgive them all. But it was a strange thing of them to do; it was a comical testimonial of my services in emancipating them. It would be well, perhaps, if I could *un-emancipate* some of them."

This was the class of Catholics against whom Bishop Milner had to contend so strongly; and, as recent events have shown, England is not yet rid of them.

Stress has been laid upon this portion of the correspondence, for, after all, the conquest of Catholic Emancipation was at once the turning-point and the crowning-point in O'Connell's career. After that great conquest, which opened the way to all the reforms and redresses since gained for Ireland, and none of which were absent from his mind and plan for the regeneration of his country, the Liberator, as he was justly titled, entered into and became a power in imperial politics. He resented the confirmed idea that Ireland was a mere province of England. It was more than that. It was a distinct people and nation from the English, willing enough to act loyally with and under the English crown and constitution, provided that that crown and constitution acted loyally, and as became a civilized government, towards the Irish people. England, under the combined persuasion of Gladstone and of Parnell and their followers, is coming to realize the force and the truth of the stand taken by O'Connell. His purpose was to create a real union of amity and comity between England and Ireland, and to abolish the unreal union that was born in corruption and maintained by cruelty and force of arms. That is the purpose of the Irish leaders and of the Irish people to-day. His desire was to bring the Irish and the English peoples together, not by chaining and sacrificing the weaker to the stronger, but by joining hands and hearts in community of interests.

And here, to drop the correspondence a moment, is it not strange—to use the mildest expression—that a great power like England should persistently persevere in maiming its right arm? For Ireland is, or surely might be, made the right arm of England. It ought to be clear by this time, even to the dullest English mind, that the Irish people are not, never were, and can never consent to be, British helots; hewers of wood, drawers of water to a cruel

and merciless power—a nation butchered to make an English holiday. The Irish people do not ask for separation from England. They ask only for their inalienable right of looking after their own affairs, a right conceded to the English colonies. If they are driven into conspiracy against English dominion, on which side lies the blame? In “Lothair” Disraeli, who lived and grew to become one of England's most powerful and astute premiers, exposed the workings of the modern secret societies in Europe. In some respects the romance, or whatever it may be called, was an outrage on Catholics. But if it be true that “the devil can cite scripture for his purpose,” it is equally true that the devil is sometimes forced to speak the truth in spite of himself. In all the countries where the chief agent of the secret societies was working to create a general uprising and the overthrow of everything existing in order to return to the worship of *Madre Natura*, he paused at Ireland. The revolutionary spirit the Irish had, and cause for it, but not the revolution he desired. There was no *Madre Natura*, no mother-nature worship for them. “The priest, the priest,” stood in the gap. What a testimony from such a man to the power of Catholic truth on a loyal Catholic people! And yet, through all O'Connell's correspondence it is seen that the Catholic Church, the Catholic faith, the Catholic prelate or priest, the Catholic Irish, are the nightmare of the Crown and of the successive Tory ministries. In point of fact, to be a Catholic was to be a criminal and an enemy of the state. The small Orange patch in Ireland received all the favor of the crown and of the authorities; the Catholic people were, as of old, the “mere Irish” without the pale. Much as Ireland has advanced in civil and religious freedom since those dark days, the same vicious tradition prevails on the part of the Crown and the government. When Mr. Gladstone proposed the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland, the Orange faction rose and declared that if the measure were passed they would kick the Queen's crown into the Boyne. The measure was passed in the face both of Orangeism and Toryism. There was a strong Orange conspiracy, of which the correspondence treats, against the very accession of the Queen to the throne, an accession which O'Connell hailed with delight as introducing a new order and a liberal reign. His allusions to the Queen are frequent and most loyal, affectionate, even, in their expression. Were he living to-day he might possibly take on a different tone. It is the same Queen who, in a speech from the throne inspired by Lord Salisbury, insisted that measures should be taken to protect her “loyal people” in Ireland—the Orange faction: the loyal people who conspired against her accession and threatened to kick her crown into the Boyne if she dared give her sanction to the abolishing of one

of the grossest abuses that ever existed. It was to the passions of these same loyal people that the Tories appealed when Mr. Gladstone introduced his measure for the better government of Ireland. It was this loyal people who declared that even if the measure were passed and became law they would never obey it, but fight to the death against it. This faction, this fraction of the Irish population, have been encouraged by successive governments in the belief that they are a law unto themselves. And to fan their passions at a passionate time went over the Tory Lord Randolph Churchill, whose mission resulted in deplorable riot and bloodshed; and as though he had not done harm enough, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, once supposed to be a Radical leader, but who deserted Mr. Gladstone when that great statesman presented his measure for the better government of Ireland, followed in Churchill's wake for the same despicable purpose of fomenting, instead of allaying, disorder.

It will be seen from all this how truly history repeats itself, especially in the relations between England and Ireland. O'Connell tried hard to win over the Orange faction to reason, justice and patriotism. In this he failed utterly, as Parnell has failed. He turned from them to Protestant and liberal England. There he succeeded much better; for the English, though slow to move out of old ruts, and slow as a people to grasp a new idea, when they do move, move once for all. They have been moving in the right direction ever since O'Connell awakened their senses and set them thinking and going. Mr. Parnell has caught and nobly wrought on the same idea. The liberation of Ireland is to come from England. It cannot be won by force of arms. Appeal to force of arms, secret or open, O'Connell always deprecated and condemned, at a time when Ireland had nine and not four millions of inhabitants. His appeal was to reason, to justice, to the Constitution of England. That is the appeal of Mr. Parnell. Since first the English crossed the Channel and gained a footing in Ireland, there began a war of race, to which, on the apostacy of the English crown and nation, was added a war of religion. Both in race and religion the Irish have through centuries proved themselves invincible. All the power of England has been exerted for centuries to crush the soul, the life, the faith out of the Irish people. The Irish people have contributed mightily to the growth of England's power. They have given her statesmen; they have given her generals; they have given her armies; they have given her lights in law and literature. And in return England has given this loyal and noble people—what? Coercion and starvation. Is it not time to change this policy, and win rather than antagonize such a people?

That question may be left to the contemplation of the English nation and English statesmen. Would it not be better, from any point of view, for England to have a contented and prosperous Ireland at her side, hand in hand with her, rather than a discontented and impoverished people? Ranters of note have said before, and say to-day, that the Irish are not fitted for self-government. Mr. James Anthony Froude is one of these. They are certainly not fitted for the government which England has given them, a far worse and harsher government than that from which the North American colonies broke away to create the United States. A people who can produce O'Connells and Parnells, men who can call up and keep together parties strong enough to hold the balance between the rival parties in England, surely shows power of self-government. Mr. Parnell and his brilliant band of followers have for years been driving O'Connell's coach and six, not through acts of Parliament alone, but through Parliament itself; and all the world testifies to the consummate skill of the present Irish leader, who has had to endure the same calumnies, the same assaults on every side, the same difficulties and dangers as O'Connell. He has met them and overcome them. His complete victory over the aspersions of the *London Times*, which was only in this matter a mouthpiece and organ of a treacherous government, has made a profound impression on England. O'Connell had to endure the most ferocious attacks from the same *Times*, under the kinsmen of the present proprietor. When the *Times* attacks the Irish leaders with such calculated virulence, it is simply attacking the Irish people. The press throughout the world must rejoice at the exposure of a great journal which places a premium on fraud and frauds. But what of the government which uses it for that very purpose?

The last days of O'Connell were clouded. His heart was with his people, to whom famine came; that fearful famine that decimated the country and formed a more powerful argument than even his genius had conceived against English rule in Ireland. His correspondence reveals to us a most beautiful and unselfish character; a character, indeed, unique in history. History he made and unmade, but always in the direction of freedom, religion and light. His life was full of good as well as of great deeds. The most pious expressions run naturally through his letters. Some of those letters, written in the pressure of great events, to members of his family, are worthy of a St. Francis de Sales. His death was a holy death. His last days were given to prayer and devotion. To his country he gave all that God gave to him. And the altar of Ireland's resurrection will be built on O'Connell.

THE JESUIT ESTATES IN CANADA.

Memoire sur les Biens des Jesuites en Canada, par un Jesuite. Montreal,
1874.
Jesuits' Estates. Answer to . . . the *Montreal Star*. By. U. E. L.

SOME of the papers in this country and in Canada, with a small portion of the population in the neighboring Dominion, have recently been exerting their utmost efforts to environ with religious prejudice a question in itself simple and easy of solution. This was the final disposition by the Canadian government of certain large estates which had passed from the hands of the British government to the hands of the provinces; estates which had been held by a strange tenure and were a constant source of discussion and debate.

While the people of Canada, with a slight military force from France, were endeavoring to hold the province against England and her colonies at the south, Louis XV., through his parliaments, drove the members of the Society of Jesus from their houses, confiscated their property, and exiled most of the members. The failure of the French arms left Canada in the possession of England, before the French authorities could enforce their decrees there.

By the surrender of Montreal, Amherst guaranteed the people liberty to exercise their religion, and the treaty of peace extended this to all parts of Canada. England, however, made one restriction. While the religious orders of women, the Ursulines and Hospital Nuns, Sisters of the Congregation, and Mme. d'Youville's Sisters of Charity were left free to pursue the work appropriate to each institute, the Jesuits and Recollects, or Reformed Franciscans, then in Canada were not viewed with as much favor, and their future hung in the uncertain scales of doubt.

Amherst refused to agree to the proposition that the Jesuits, Sulpicians and Recollects should retain their property, and the Jesuits and Sulpicians should continue to present to certain parishes, as they had hitherto done. It is left in doubt whether both clauses or only the latter was objected to. The fact is that the three communities were left in possession of their property, and the Sulpicians have never been disquieted.

The capitulation, however, gave the religious communities the right to sell their landed property, if they preferred to leave the colony. As it had guaranteed by the 33d article that all the re-

ligious communities and all priests should retain the right of property and enjoyment of the seigneuries and other estates possessed by them in the colony, the right to sell covered the whole ground.

The treaty of Paris granted the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada, and allowed those who preferred to leave the colony to sell their estates within eighteen months, but required that they be sold to British subjects. It may be asked whether this necessarily included the religious communities. On this point there can be no doubt, for Martinique, like Canada, passed into the hands of England during this same war, and was given up by France. There the Jesuits actually sold their property after the island had passed under the British flag.

During the war some of the Jesuit property was occupied by the British authorities, including part of their college at Quebec, but this was simply to meet the exigencies of military occupation, and affected no rights of property.

The territory west of the Mississippi was retained by France, and there the acts of the French parliaments against the Jesuits were copied and enforced. The Louisiana authorities seized all the Jesuit property, and not only that, but some of their over-zealous officials crossed the Mississippi and pretended to seize and sell the property of the Society of Jesus at Kaskaskia and even at Vincennes, although these little towns were on British soil, and no longer subject to the French crown. The territory northwest of the Ohio was not at first governed by England as part of Canada, but made a military district under General Gage. That commander and his officers treated the Louisiana sale as a nullity, which it really was, but as there was no Jesuit Father in possession they occupied and held it.

In Canada the greater part of the property was left in the hands of the members of the Society of Jesus. Their title to the whole of their estates was recognized and undisputed. Whatever revenue arose from these was received by them and expended for the objects to which it had always been applied, the maintenance of the Catholic religion, the instruction of youth and the Indian missions. Before the Church and before the world there was nothing to alter their relations to the property which they had so long, and as history proves, so beneficially administered. In 1773, Pope Clement XIV. by his brief suppressed the Society of Jesus, and made the members, as secular priests, subject to the bishops of the diocese where they happened to be, and by the laws of the Church the bishops were to administer the property, as ecclesiastical goods, for the objects intended in the original grant or purchase, or to which they had been habitually applied.

Wherever this brief was formally promulgated by the bishop of

the diocese, and the members of the Society gave in their adhesion, the bishops, as a rule, entered into possession of the property, allowing each member of the society during life an annual amount for his decent and proper support and maintenance. In all Catholic countries the brief was formally promulgated. In Prussia and Russia the government forbade the Catholic bishops to promulgate or enforce it. In England the Vicars-Apostolic promulgated it, and Bishop Challoner, Vicar-Apostolic of the London district, promulgated it, not only in the part of England subject to his jurisdiction, but also in Maryland and Pennsylvania, where the missionaries of the Society signed a document expressing their adhesion to the brief; but probably, not being diocesan bishops, they nowhere took possession of the property.

But in Canada it was never promulgated. The Bishop of Quebec, by the advice and direction of Lord Dorchester, then governor, took no steps in the matter; the Fathers of the Society were not called upon to accept the brief or dissolve. He explained his reasons to the Holy See, and his action was not censured. They remained Jesuits as they did in Prussia and Russia, where in time their continuing to live under their rule and enjoy their property was expressly sanctioned by the Holy See. In the law of the Catholic Church the brief did not in any respect alter the condition of the Jesuits in Canada.

The College of Quebec was maintained till 1776, when the British authorities in Canada deemed it necessary for the public service, during the war between England and the States which had declared their independence, to occupy some of the buildings belonging to the Jesuits. Most of the college at Quebec was used by them for the archives of the province; the house at Three Rivers for a prison, and on the death of Father Well at Montreal the house there was also used for government purposes.

These acts were not in pursuance of any act of parliament or of any legal process, but were simply such acts as are often done under the plea of military necessity.

The famous Quebec Act of 1774 had indeed excepted the religious orders and communities from the guarantee by which the Canadian people and clergy were declared enabled to hold their property and possessions, notwithstanding any acts, proclamations, commissions or ordinances.

The effect of this exception in the Quebec Act could not divest any one of property. No such result can follow from implication. At most it made the Quebec Act inoperative in favor of the Jesuits' title to their estates, leaving them to maintain their rights on such other grounds as they might have.

Even the English government recognized the fact that the

Jesuit estates in Canada had not passed out of the hands of the Society, for when Lord Amherst applied, in 1787, for a grant of part of these lands, the English Privy Council, which has seldom been reluctant to bestow on favorites of the crown any estates to which the king might have the most shadowy title, positively refused.

The British officials in Canada, not under any law or act of parliament, prohibited the Jesuits from receiving any novices or members from other countries. Indeed, they carried this so far that when, after the conquest of Canada, Father Hunter visited Canada from Maryland, which was passing from one British province to another, he was not permitted to remain, but was at once ordered to leave the province.

Unable to maintain their body either by receiving novices or members from Russia, where the Society existed, the Jesuits in Canada became a kind of Tontine association, the property vesting in the survivors till finally all was held by Father Casot, who died in 1800, having enjoyed to the last the income of all seigneuries and property not occupied by government under pretext of military or other necessity of the public service.

Father Casot either held these estates as an individual subject or as ecclesiastical property. If they belonged absolutely to him, they went under the treaty of Paris to his heirs, or in default of heirs escheated to the crown. If he held them in trust for pious uses as ecclesiastical property, the state could not, without violating the capitulations and the treaty of Paris, confiscate them. It was bound to take steps to see that the income should be applied as it had been for more than a century, that is, to the maintenance of Catholic worship, the education of youth and the support of Indian missions. By the law of the Catholic Church the Bishop of Quebec, whose diocese then embraced all Canada, was the proper person and only person to administer this property and apply the revenues.

The Bishop of Quebec had not been silent. Mgr. Briand addressed the king on the matter of the Jesuit estates, when Lord Amherst's application was known. "I asked their preservation for the good of the colony," he wrote. "It was only this view that made me, when in London, so earnestly ask their preservation; from the same motives mentioned last year, after explaining at length my sentiments on the question to your Excellency, to present to his Gracious Majesty, George III., our sovereign, a petition tending to the same end. But what has been my surprise and grief when I learned that they not only aimed to destroy the Jesuits, but proposed to wrest from the Church their estates even, consecrated to God and religion. . . . Was it not natural to confide to the seminary, now in

charge of the college, the property which belonged to the college maintained by the Jesuits, if they are not allowed to exist ? ”

Father Glapion, the Superior of the Jesuits, had in 1788, before a commission instituted to examine what right the crown had to the Jesuit estates, boldly claimed that the Society was absolutely entitled to its estates by gift from the French crown, from individuals and by purchase. That as a body corporate they could hold, was evident from the fact that a patent of Louis XIV., in 1678, recognized and so declared.

The commission could not, and apparently did not, find that the estates had vested in the crown ; and it was deemed best to make a step in the matter in an indirect way, and on the royal instructions of September 16th, 1791, this clause was inserted : It is our will and pleasure “that the Society of Jesus be suppressed and dissolved, and no longer continued as a body corporate or politic, and all their possessions and property shall be vested in us for such purposes as we may hereafter think fit to direct and appoint ; but we think fit to declare our royal intention to be, that the present members of the said Society, as established at Quebec, shall be allowed sufficient stipends and provisions during their natural lives.”

This was in direct violation of the capitulation of Montreal, recognizing the Jesuits and authorizing them to sell their property, and of the treaty of Paris. And it is not easy to see how, under English systems of law, a mere paragraph in royal instructions to a colonial governor could deprive an individual or a corporation of its property.

In point of fact the clause remained a dead letter, and no action was taken till the death of Father Casot. When that event occurred the government took possession of the property ; the question is, whether rightfully or wrongfully. Every fair-minded person must admit that it was wrongfully. The estates did not escheat by the death of Father Casot, without legal heirs ; for it was not his individual property. The Society of Jesus held and administered it as ecclesiastical property, for known and recognized objects ; it was part of the property of the Catholic Church in Canada.

No act of parliament was passed vesting it in the crown, and the introduction of such a statute would have excited more prolonged debates than those on the Quebec Act, when the right of the Jesuits to hold their property and even sell it, if they left the colony, was fully recognized.

The government in Canada took possession of the property without defining in any way by what tenure they held it. Their discreet silence could not alter facts or make it in their hands any the less ecclesiastical property of the Catholic Church. Government was bound to apply the income as it had been applied. The Eng-

lish penal laws had no force in Canada and could not affect the case.

The British rulers in Canada took pains to make the income small. The total revenue from 1800 to 1831 was \$193,334.85, and the expenses \$188,973.46, so that only some three hundred dollars a year found its way to the treasury! What was expended from this property of the Catholic Church in Canada was given solely and exclusively to Protestant churches and institutions. Between 1818 and 1827, \$39,152.57 was given to Protestant churches; \$49,481.38 to royal grammar schools (Protestant) at Quebec, Montreal and Kingston. Other amounts were paid to Protestant clergymen, and it is of common repute in Canada that for some years a salary was paid to a gentleman who came highly recommended from England, but for whom no place could be found, till some one, with more ingenuity than conscience, suggested creating the office of chaplain to the Jesuit estates, and the gentleman was accordingly installed with a comfortable salary!

The Catholic bishops of Canada were not indifferent spectators of this spoliation of the Church and perversion of its revenues, but after the conquest of Canada they found the English government indisposed to carry out the treaty, and as British subjects they could not appeal to the French government to demand of England a just and honest execution of the capitulations and treaty. They were helpless, and found a deaf ear turned to all their appeals for justice; and, as we have seen, were forced to behold the property of the Catholic Church used to support Protestant churches, schools and ministers, for not a cent of this Catholic revenue was ever granted to any Catholic bishop, church, institution or clergyman.

At a time when the project of a mixed university was mooted in Canada, Bishop Hubert (November 18th, 1789), in a forcible letter to the Hon. William Smith, Chief Justice of Quebec, set forth the claim of the Church to the old Jesuit college, then used as a barrack for troops, and made a claim for means from the Jesuit estates to restore and maintain that institution and develop it into a university, as well as to support and extend the Indian missions, in which he took a personal interest, having been himself stationed in Detroit and Illinois. But the appeal was unheeded. At a subsequent period, Bishop Joseph Signay, of Quebec, with his coadjutor Bishop Turgeon and Bishop Lartigue, then suffragan, and in time first Bishop of Montreal, addressed a petition to the provincial parliament of Lower Canada, in which they said: "Your petitioners humbly considering that the Society of Jesus being extinct in this country, their natural successors as to the

object of their institute are the Catholic bishops of the diocese. The crown having transferred this property to the province to be applied according to its original destination, the undersigned believe that they are entitled to claim the administration of this property as Church property.

"Your petitioners therefore humbly ask that the administration of the said property be confided to the bishops under such conditions as the legislature may impose," etc.

This appeal was fruitless, and in January, 1845, the Archbishop of Quebec, the Bishops of Montreal and Kingston, and their coadjutors, and the Bishop of Toronto, addressed the legislature. They recited that the government had for forty-four years preserved intact the Jesuit property and had now, influenced doubtless by a feeling of justice and equity, transferred it to the provincial legislature to be employed in promoting education; then they proceeded to declare that "the Catholic Church in Canada had a right to claim that this property should be transferred to them to be employed according to its primitive destination, as besides the education to be afforded to Canadians, the donors and acquirers of this property had other objects in view, such as the propagation of the Catholic faith among the Indians, the offering of Masses, etc., objects which cannot be fulfilled without the ministry of the Catholic bishops.

The clergy of the dioceses of Quebec and Montreal also in 1847 addressed the parliament, claiming that this property belonged of right to the Catholic Church and should be restored to it. Similar appeals were made by the Archbishop of Quebec, and his suffragans in 1878, and by the Archbishop in 1885.

It will thus be seen that the Church constantly and persistently put forward its claim to the property as exclusive owner, illegally and wrongfully deprived of the due enjoyment of what under the treaty of Paris belonged to it.

Meanwhile, changes had taken place in the position of affairs. The Society of Jesus, recognized in Russia, was re-established throughout the world by Pope Pius VII., in 1814, and the General in Russia was approved as General of the Order, by the Sovereign Pontiff, who restored to the body such houses in the Pontifical States as were held by government. The Society spread. The old province of France revived, and in 1842 it sent a colony to resume the labors of the Society in Canada, where the Fathers were warmly welcomed. They founded St. Mary's College and a fine church at Montreal, residences at Quebec, Three Rivers and in Upper Canada, revived their Indian missions, and have, within a few years, established a second college at St. Boniface, Manitoba. All this was not accomplished without great cost and outlay, and

they naturally began to feel, amid their struggles for the good of religion in Canada, that the property of the old mission should be restored to them to continue and extend their work which was identical with that carried on by their predecessors, and for which the property had been originally acquired.

In 1873, a question arose in the legislature in regard to the old Jesuit college at Quebec, known of late years by the somewhat odd title of Jesuit Barracks; for though the government could place soldiers there, it could not drive from the mind of the Catholic Canadians the fact that it really belonged to the Jesuits. On this occasion, Mr. David, one of the members, asked the Ministry whether in disposing of this building it had any intention of making compensation to the original owners. The whole question was thus opened, and has since been an object of discussion in Canada.

On the Protestant side a small but active and bigoted body resisted any attempt to restore the Jesuit estates, or any part of them, to the Catholic Church, and all the usual tirades against the Church and the Jesuits were resorted to. It was claimed that they were really government property, and that the Jesuits had been suppressed; that the rights of the bishops had lapsed, and that the Jesuits now in Canada could not claim succession to the members of the former mission. In fact, that as this property, rightly or wrongly, had been used for years for the benefit of Protestant churches and institutions, the system ought to continue.

Among Catholics there was also a division of opinion. Some held that by the brief of Clement XIV., even though not promulgated, a right of property vested in the Bishop of Quebec, and that his failure or inability to take possession did not in the eye of the Church impair their right. The Laval University and the Seminary of Quebec, which took up the work of the old Jesuit college and had done so much for higher education, also made a claim to some portion of the estates.

The Fathers of the Society applied to the Sovereign Pontiff for authority to petition for a restoration of the property, or an equivalent for it. A Papal indult, issued April 19th, 1871, gave the General of the Order the authority, and Father Turgeon, as delegate of the General, took steps to make a formal appeal to the government in Canada.

The Papal indult, placed in the hands of the procurator of the Jesuits, enabled them to give a legal discharge or receipt in full to the Province of Quebec for the property, and so ease the public conscience by putting an end to a great wrong. When the money which might be agreed upon as compensation is paid by the government, the Society of Jesus cannot appropriate to its own use

any part thereof till the highest authority in the Church decides on the disposition to be made of it.

The indult, we may say, gave a definite person the right to appear as plaintiff in the case, as representing the Society of Jesus and the Catholic Church.

The case was at once taken up and pursued steadily. Mr. Mercier, Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec, at last introduced a bill to pay \$400,000 in settlement of all claims of the Church and the Society of Jesus to the estates in question. It was but a small percentage of the actual value, and took no account of the income received during the present century. So far as the government was concerned, it was settling an old and valid claim on very easy terms by a compromise. Such settlements are not unknown even south of the St. Lawrence. The Common Council of the city of New York once gave a Presbyterian church the block between Nassau Street, Park Row, and Beekman Street, to be occupied exclusively for a church. A brick church, with attendant buildings, was erected there and maintained for many years; but in time the congregation moved farther up town. The church was not needed by the Presbyterian body, but service was kept up *pro forma*, and the annexed buildings were rented out in part or in whole. At last the Brick Presbyterian church corporation made a compromise with the city. If they closed the church or attempted to sell the property they lost all rights. As long as they held on the city could not dispossess them. It was finally agreed that the property should be sold, and that part of the proceeds go to the treasury of the city of New York, and the rest to the corporation of the Brick Presbyterian church.

There was no denunciation by Catholics or Catholic journals of this compromise, nor did the Catholic papers resound with accusations against the Presbyterian body.

The bill introduced into the Quebec legislature under the auspices of Mr. Mercier recited at length the whole history of the question, enumerated the petitions and claims of the Canadian bishops, the action of the Jesuits, the sanction given them at Rome to petition the Quebec government, and the whole negotiation between Father Turgeon as procurator of the Society and the Ministry; the claim of Father Turgeon for one-half of one of the estates which the Society had purchased, and the final decision of the minister not to go beyond \$400,000, as that amount had once been named in behalf of the Church.

The act itself was short, and provided for the appropriation of \$400,000 to remain in the provincial treasury till the Pope ratified the settlement, and made known his wishes respecting the distribution of the amount within the Province of Quebec.

Some objection was made to the introduction of the Pope and his government in the preamble, but when it was explained that ~~as~~ this was a settlement with the Church, the action of the head of the Church must necessarily appear to make the action final, the adverse action was withdrawn.

The act passed the Quebec legislature with very little opposition and became a law.

But the question did not end there. An act of a local legislature in Canada may be vetoed. The battle had to be fought again at Ottawa, where the rights of the Catholic Church, and especially of the Jesuits, were not likely to appeal strongly to the conscience of all men. The floodgates were at once let loose. The newspapers teemed with charges, and the agents of the Associated Press, who seem to be selected for their gross ignorance and grosser prejudice against everything Catholic, flooded the papers in the United States with dishonest telegrams.

One old calumny, started when Canadian history was but little known, was revived, when to repeat it convicted the writer either of wanton bad faith or of utter ignorance of the history of the province at a time when public and private libraries teem with books and manuscripts for every year of Canada's annals. The charge was that the Jesuits acquired much of their property by wronging the Indians, and it was gravely asserted that they had deprived the Hurons of Lorette of the seigneurie of Sillery, to which the tribe was justly entitled. Years ago this claim was presented to the legislature of Lower Canada, and a bill introduced for the relief of the Hurons. The Hon. D. B. Viger had been detained from attending by illness; when he arrived, and learned of the bill and the favor shown it by many members, he upbraided them with their ignorance of the history of the colony. Hurons at Sillery! The Hurons never were at Sillery, and never had the slightest claim to it. He soon convinced the house, and the subject was dropped. There were in those days few libraries in Canada. Mr. Faribault had but just begun his work, and there might be some excuse or palliation for the ignorance of members, but for the press of Canada or the United States to repeat the story in the year 1889, is to show a state of ignorance utterly incomprehensible and disgraceful. The "*Relations des Jésuites*" were reprinted several years ago at Quebec; Charlevoix's "*History of New France*" is accessible in French and English. In these alone, without referring to other works, the history of the Sillery mission may be traced. The "*Relations*" show that the seigneurie was acquired by the Christian charity of Noel Brulart de Sillery, Knight of Malta, for the purpose of establishing a mission there

for the Algonquins; that the mission was maintained at Sillery exclusively for the Algonquins for several years; and that no Hurons were settled there. In time the wars with the Iroquois, the scarcity of game, and disease thinned the little body of Christian Algonquins, and a party of Abnakis from the Kennebec were received there. These were followed by others of the same tribe, and it became mainly an Abnaki mission. The transition was easy, as Algonquin and Abnaki spoke dialects of the same widespread language, whereas the Hurons spoke a radically different language.

In time the land became exhausted, and the Jesuit Fathers removed the Indians to Rivière du Loup, and finally to St. François, where the remnant of this old Sillery mission remains. At no time were Hurons at Sillery or the subsequent stations. Yet this shallow falsehood has gone the rounds of a press which prides itself on its intelligence!

More coarse and conscienceless was the Canadian journal that published a spurious oath which its editor pretended every Jesuit took, disavowing allegiance to any temporal government, and promising to do no end of wicked and shameful acts. Against this paper the Jesuits promptly brought a suit for libel.

In the Dominion parliament Colonel O'Brien, the leader of the strong anti-Catholic organizations in Ontario, introduced a measure to prevent the sanction of the Act passed at Quebec. Dalton McCarthy, another member, also spoke in favor of disallowance, but the leading men of Canada, Sir John Macdonald, Edward Blake, Sir John Thompson, Alexander Mackenzie, sustained the action of the Quebec legislature, and the act was sustained by a vote of 188 to 13.

The Dominion Evangelical Alliance, the Presbytery of Montreal and others had petitioned the Privy Council of the Dominion to recall its recommendation that the Act should be left to its operation, but the Council, in reply to each and all, declined to do so.

They talk of appealing to the queen; but some sense of self-respect must exist among them.

So far as Canada is concerned, the whole question is settled. A great moral wrong has been redressed. An historic body, whose labors and services in the cause of education and science, in the cause of Christian evangelization among the Indian tribes from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the shadow of the Rocky Mountains, holding life as naught, were rewarded by oppression and rapine, receives a full and complete justification.

A comparatively small amount is restored to the Church. Under the decision of the Holy See, only a part will go to aid the

Society of Jesus in meeting the debts incurred in its work for the benefit of Canada; the rest in the hands of the Canadian bishops will be devoted to pious uses.

The old Jesuit college at Quebec was an eye-sore to many, and at last an order was obtained for its demolition on the ground that it had become insecure and dangerous, and might at any moment fall on the heads of people passing along the street. Against this act of vandalism the bishops of the province protested plainly, and experts declared that the walls were perfectly sound and safe, that the pretended fears were purely chimerical.

But in spite of remonstrance it was determined to remove the ancient Catholic landmark in the city of Champlain. The work of demolishing the old Jesuit structure began in May, 1877. The workmen found the stone and mortar of the walls blended into a mass like wrought iron. All through the year they toiled till winter stopped their operations. In the spring the work was resumed, and explosives were employed to level the walls which had been declared to be so dangerous; and it was not till far into the year 1879 that the government succeeded in leveling to the earth the building where so many Canadian explorers and officers had been trained, and from whose portals so many heroic missionaries had gone forth to their noble work.

Faucher de St. Maurice, an eminent literary man, discovered vaults containing evidently the remains of some of the early Jesuits. Before he could arrange for their removal, they were surreptitiously abstracted. In a "Relation," eloquent with tenderness and feeling, he raised a monument to the ancient structure.

This episode betrays the un-Christian character of the whole opposition to the claim of the Church.

TRIPLE ORDER OF SCIENCE—PHYSICS, META-PHYSICS AND FAITH.

IN a previous article we called attention to a triple order of science. It has been said that that article seemed to belittle the efforts of conscientious investigators in physical science. Nothing could have been farther from its intention. Its purpose was to note the evil done, in the name of "Science," by those who do not recognize the triple order, and who try to obliterate the clearly drawn lines of division between physics, metaphysics and faith. We return to this subject of the boundary lines, since a very definite knowledge of the place of physics is the key to the abundant sophistry that is palmed off upon the public as science.

Physics (taking in the whole range of physical science) has nothing to do with first causes or final causes. It deals exclusively with matter. Its province does not go beyond material phenomena. By observation and repeated experiment it tries to discover the general laws that regulate the action of the material universe. It proceeds upon the axiom that the laws of nature are constant. As physics, it does not embrace the cases in which there may be a deviation from the known constancy of action in the forces of nature. Physics,—material science,—so long as it keeps to its domain, pursues a rigorous method. It is perfectly logical; and we may subscribe in advance, as philosophers and theologians, to all the conclusions which it draws legitimately in its own sphere. It refers material phenomena to their immediate causes. But it has nothing to do with essence, prime origin or final destiny. In so far as it goes, it can give us real certainty. But we must be on our guard to distinguish carefully what is *certain* from certain preconceived conclusions which physics does not, cannot demonstrate, and which we know from other sources to be not only undemonstrable, but utterly false. In the controversy of our day the comparatively youthful science of geology plays a very important part. It affords us—to be liberal with it—a clear demonstration of the great antiquity of our globe; of the existence of an azoic or lifeless period before the organic period; of progressive succession in the forms of life; and of man's comparatively recent appearance. Besides this definite certainty with regard to some things, geology has its hypotheses which bear an air of probability; and some of its probabilities are becoming daily more settled by the discovery of new facts. Still, probability is only probability, and

must be treated as such. So long as it does not contradict *certain* principles, we must allow it to pass as *probability*. But we cannot allow it to be forced upon us as certainty; nor will we admit as certainty any conclusion that is drawn from it as a premise. Neither can we admit that because all laws of physics were once held as hypotheses, all existing hypotheses are to be regarded as so many future laws. The changes that twenty-five years have wrought in fundamental chemistry should suffice to make us prudent in our use and advocacy of physical hypotheses.

Whilst recognizing seriously in the interest of truth the authority of material science, we should cultivate the critical habit of rejecting the dreams of that class of "scientists" who do not adhere to the true method of material science, which is purely experimental, but who jump at conclusions with "missing links"; who are too ready to emancipate themselves from the laws of lawful induction; who, without analyzing their own synthesis, make assertions that overleap their experiment; who parade as truth what is sometimes only comical hypothesis; and who discourse on essence, cause, origin and finality as if—well, as if they were metaphysicians. From the literature of material science we might gather a library of hasty conclusions, rash assertions and wrecked hypotheses. And in our day there is manifested a daring, truly homeric, to prop up pet theories with *facts* of which there is no record. We should not say that it is never allowable to make the supposition of a fact for the purpose of testing a theory. But we protest against proclaiming as laws, theories that are based on such presumptions.

As an illustration of hypothetical geology, we summarize from a work on the antiquity of man, by M. de Mortillet, Professor at the Paris School of Anthropology. He wishes to prove the scriptural age of man absurd. He bases his conclusion upon four hypotheses. He boldly fixes the exact proportion of the prehistoric ages. Then by hypothesis of identity between the glacial and another period, fixes the duration of this, even in his mind, indefinite period at 100,000 years. Finally, he says, when *we know* this duration to have been 100,000 years, we can put the appearance of man on the earth at between 230,000 and 240,000 years ago. This is but one example in a thousand. The hypothetical biology of Mr. Haeckel is just as interesting. His method of doing away with the fiction of a spiritual or even an immaterial soul may be reduced to the following: (1) To assume the existence of the organic molecule, which he calls plastidule, with its own soul (mechanical force); (2) to assume that the reunion of these little plastidular souls makes the soul (mechanical force) of the cellule; (3) to assume that the reunion of these cellular souls (forces)

makes what people have agreed to call the "soul" in an organized being, whether animal, plant or man; (4) to assume that the more complex functions called thought, intelligence, reason, being exerted especially in the brain, the brain has, therefore, privileged plastidules or organic molecules which form psychic cellules. If your curiosity prompts you to go back to the beginning to see what, after all, are those original little molecular souls, you will find that they are only an undulatory, rhythmic, ramified motion, dependent on atomic mechanism. *Satis.*

But to come nearer home and to use an illustration that will serve as one for all: When was there ever a theory that so came to take the intellectual world by very storm as the theory of evolution. What theory has ever been so importunately forced into notice. We who were disposed to be incredulous were told that we knew nothing of the facts; that we might pass our time more profitably in going through the storehouse of science than in presuming to reject untried the discoveries of science. And if we laughed at the anti-climax of the theory—the rubbing off of the tail—we were little better than arch-heretics, so ignorant, forsooth, that ridicule was the only argument we could bring against the dogmas of "science." Well, to be sure, as the researches were new, and in novel lines, the only policy we had to pursue was to be silent, to read, to watch, to note the facts of discovery, to demand in every instance the tests required for the formulating of a law. And what has been the result? Only this, that the evolution theory started without a fact and has ended without a fact. The storehouse of nature has been simply ransacked to find one fact. And we, though laymen in "science," know that the constancy of a fact under every variety of condition is required to establish a physical law. It might be answered that the evolution of varieties of life was advanced only as something fortuitous. Well, even for this fortuitous evolution not one fact is forthcoming. On the contrary, whatever has been discovered only confirms the doctrine of the creation of species. For though the record on the rocks shows us that, as time advanced, the types of life increased in number and elevation, and became more specific, the very same record shows that the types, at their first appearance, appeared at their best, and *if* they changed, that they changed only to degenerate and thus to become extinct, but never to advance to a higher type. We know of no one who has meditated more seriously upon the evolutionist philosophy than has Sir J. W. Dawson. He says, "it has been well characterized as the 'baldest of all the philosophies which have sprung up in our world.'" He continues: "that in our day a system destitute of any shadow of proof, and supported merely by vague analogies and figures of speech, and by the arbitrary and

artificial coherence of its own parts, should be accepted as a philosophy and should find able adherents to string upon its thread of hypotheses our vast and weighty stores of knowledge, is surpassingly strange."¹ Sir J. W. Dawson does not, as we do not, deny or undervalue the physical research that has been made. How could he without misapprehending the fact of his own life? To conclude, therefore, "Evolution" is a hypothesis. It rests upon another hypothesis—that of the missing links. The hypothesis of the missing links is made to satisfy the other hypothesis of evolution. Thus the whole theory is an assumption based on an assumption. Even as regards the Trilobites of the Devonian, Barrande, the celebrated Bohemian palæontologist, has traced their history and shown that they are, *if* an argument, a very clear one against the theory of the derivation of species.

So much for hypothesis. At the Anthropologic Congress, held in Germany in 1882, Virchow ventured this suggestion to the assembly, that it would be well for investigators not to draw conclusions so hastily, but to profit by sad experience and examine things twice. He advised even the relegating of hypotheses to notes, leaving the text for established facts. What a reduction in the text this would make! To conclude on this point, therefore: First: We admit all facts in advance; we encourage research; we are glad to have the record of its results; every fact known, or yet undiscovered, is in harmony with the doctrines of Christianity; there can be no opposition between truth and truth. Secondly: We reject, in advance, every theory that is in opposition with the known truth; and we object to having the discovered truths of science trimmed away so as to be forced in as paving stones upon the road to error. We turn now to a higher science, philosophy, metaphysics.

Mr. Büchner² will tell us that the deep thought of Plato, Leibnitz, Bossuet, may serve to dupe novices, but that it is only to be smiled at by scientists (as Büchner). Now how are we to reply to men who use language of this description regarding the world's recognized geniuses? What is Büchner, in his microscopic studies of dirt, to Plato, in his sublime thought? Professor Lange makes bold to insult faith and intelligence by asserting that metaphysics and religion have no objective reality.³ Do we not answer mildly when we say that Professor Lange knows nothing of either? Helmholtz beards us with the astounding declaration that our philosophy soars on the wings of Icarus (metaphysics). Is it too

¹ *The Story of the Earth and Man*, ch. 14.

² *Force and Matter*.

³ *History of Materialism*, vol. i., p. 3.

much to charge him with ignorance, to tell him that he is out of his sphere? It is one thing to be a patient and acute observer, experimenter; another thing¹ to be a philosopher. But why do we select our examples from among the Germans? Because the English and American writers of the same class are little more than copyists of the Germans. However, what do we mean by metaphysics?

Our "scientists" pride themselves upon their logic. But strange to say, they do not know that metaphysics—the general metaphysics—lies at the base of all sound logic. Metaphysics teaches us where to draw the line between the essential and the non-essential, to discriminate between substance and accident. It treats of undemonstrable first truths. It discusses the nature of cause and effect and defines the conditions necessary for the ascribing of one thing to another, as effect to cause. What is there so very childish in all this? We fear the charge falls back upon those who make it. A greater thinker than all these exponents of the "clay age" has said that all human knowledge strikes its roots in metaphysics. These "scientists," these devotees of clay, are constantly using metaphysics, though they do not know it. Whenever they strive to analyze or classify, they call to their aid some principle of metaphysics, some principle whose certainty is independent of experiment, and without which a law could never be formulated out of physical phenomena. The metaphysical principle of causality underlies the whole of physical science, which is science only in so far as it makes use of this principle. We cannot think without metaphysics. We cannot think without generalizing and classifying, and we are metaphysicians in the very act by which we would repudiate the title. Metaphysics has less need of physics than physics has of metaphysics. It is to be counted a great boon of nature that metaphysics does not entirely desert its post of mental surveillance, even in the case of the very men who abjure it.

If we turn now to a higher degree in the scale of knowledge, to the higher science, to faith, we shall find the men of the slime school—when confronted by the supernatural—only growing in bitterness, in mockery, in eagerness to asperse. This spirit of hatred for the higher knowledge has never motivated the expressions of the great men whose names remain and will remain. It was not with this predetermined spirit of hatred that those researches were undertaken which have left us the names of Copernicus, Newton, Linnæus, Ampère, Faraday, etc. However, there is much truth in the proverb about the empty wagon—that in

¹ *Critical Exposition of the Sources of Knowledge.*

passing it makes the most noise. We hear the rumble in the Congresses of Science. In the Congress of Rostock (1872), Virchow, the president, openly proclaimed that no understanding was to be had with those who believed in a spiritual soul and a positive religion; above all, none with those who professed Christianity. We have not forgotten the noise made by the address of Mr. Tyndall, when presiding at the Belfast Congress of 1874. The *Scientific American*, commenting on the Belfast address, says (September 26, 1874): "It is no longer a question of the earth's form, or position, or age, that marks the conflict of science and religion; no more is it a question of man's place in nature, his relation to other forms of life, or the origin of his physical frame; these outposts have been carried and the citadel itself is entered; the distinction between mind and matter, or matter and spirit, is denied, and with it the personal immortality of man, the personal dominion of the universe, and all that these involve." We merely remark the very pitiable arrogance of this longing *to be as the beast and no more*. Just another citation—this time from Paul Bert, a late coryphæus in his school. In a newspaper article (*Répub. Fr.*, August 31, 1881), speaking of scientific and religious teaching, he says that "the former rests upon reason, which engenders science; the latter, which is the teaching of the Church, affirms, and, in affirming, rests upon faith, the mother of superstition, and becomes, as it were fatally, the school of fanaticism and imbecility." We have here a bright example of the bad faith that is brought to the support of a bad cause. Proofs, of course, we never have to confront; nay, not even an attempt at proof. The weapons of attack are simply denial, mockery and bad language. In the onslaught upon metaphysics there is generally some outward show of argument, which in so far as it goes is but a clumsy use of metaphysics itself. But when religion is attacked, even the show of argument is usually neglected; and the whole programme is repeatedly made up of two very old numbers: 1. Aspersion by some new leader; 2. A chorus of exultation. The ignorance displayed in the attack upon metaphysics is wisdom as compared with the blindness of spirit in which men are hurried on in the war against faith. They do not recognize a defeat. They do not listen to a reply. Their whole method of meeting an adversary lies in not meeting him. It is the evasive method of Mr. Huxley, who, after asking questions about the continuance of consciousness (*i.e.*, the immortality of the soul), says: "And I am afraid that, like jesting Pilate, I shall not think it worth while (having but little time before me) to wait for an answer."¹

¹ Mr. Huxley in *Fortnightly Review*, December, 1886, p. 799.

It is not necessary here to institute an analysis of the act of faith to show the value of knowledge possessed by faith. It should be enough to know that faith rests upon evidence—an evidence more powerful to beget certainty than the evidence of experimental physics. It is the evidence of infallible authority, and there is no need of repeated experiment. A single consideration should make manifest the absurdity of the attack of pseudo-science upon faith as a basis of knowledge. For faith is based upon the evidence of Divine Revelation; and the Revelation is a historical fact. Now Strauss and Renan—master and disciple—the two most influential enemies of Christianity since the encyclopedists,—Strauss and Renan, dealing *ex professo* in history, declared that in the war against the fact of Revelation they met with defeat. They then placed the issue in the hands of materialistic experimenters. But who is there who knows the nature and scope of physical experiment, but sees the absurdity of employing it as a means to expunge historical fact? “Science” cannot destroy history. The fact of the Revelation stands, and with it the obligation of belief in the truths revealed, whether we may or may not be able to develop them with the dim light of unaided reason. The fact of Revelation has proved itself in the history of man; and the language of its opponents shows a bad cause.

It is certainly very valuable, in the pursuit of truth, to have a code of laws to guide us through intricate problems where reason even loses its way; to know from a higher authority when a position is certainly untenable, and thus be spared many a long, tedious and fruitless experience. In fact, the solid, steady advance of truly scientific thought under the guidance of dogma is patent to all but the blind. Dogma leaves absolute liberty of investigation for the unknown; but it indicates, in advance, false routes and corrects faulty hypotheses. Dogma never stands between physics and its fact. But dogma intervenes when there is question of drawing conclusions—or rather of making assertions which cannot be the result of argument; and it puts an end to those flights which are not of reason but of imagination. Yet do we find men who, rather than be guided by an unfailing authority, are willing to go to any length of contradiction. In rebellious pride they waste their lives seeking for systems that will exclude Revelation, God, Creation, and all intelligence above the visible things of the world. They catch at every vague unwarranted assertion to arm themselves against the spectre of the supersensible and supernatural. Fleeing from the light of metaphysics and of faith, they are as Voudoos before every jack-o'-lantern physical theory which can bid to lure them deeper into the darkness and the mire. The absurd situations which so-called “science” thus constantly makes

for itself in its flight from metaphysics and faith would be very laughable were they not so pitiable. Professor Borden P. Bowne has with very delicate touch characterized this—call it which you will—blindness or insincerity of modern “science.” In the preface to his work on “The Philosophy of Theism,” referring to the eagerness of some speculators to account for the order and design in the world without making mention of a superior intelligence of God, Professor Bowne says: “That nature, when driven out with a fork, always comes running back, is a discovery of ancient date. We have an excellent illustration of this law in the way in which language has avenged the attempt to discredit the teleological view of nature. Teleology has taken entire possession of the language of botany and biology, especially when expounded in the terms of evolution. Even plants do the most acute and far-sighted things to maintain their existence. They specialize themselves with a view to cross-fertilization and make nothing of changing species or genus to reach their ends. A supply is often regarded as fully explained when the need is pointed out, and evolution itself is not unfrequently endowed with mental attributes. Such extraordinary mythology arises from the necessity for recognizing purpose in the world; and as it would not be in good form to speak of a divine purpose, there is no shift but to attribute it to ‘Nature’ or ‘Evolution’ or ‘Law,’ or some other of the home-made divinities of the day” (page vii.). In the preceding paragraph, Professor Bowne had said: “Except in philosophy and theology, there is coming to be a decided conviction that no one has a right to an opinion who has not studied the subject. Off-hand decisions of unstudied questions receive very little consideration nowadays in the sciences. It is to be hoped that this mental seriousness may yet extend to philosophy and theology. At present it is not so. He would be a rare man indeed who could not settle questions in theology or Biblical criticism without previous study; while the small men who could dispose of philosophy and philosophers in one afternoon are legion.”

The following words from Sir J. W. Dawson, whilst corroborating the bold expressions of Professor Bowne, will form a very fitting conclusion to these pages: “Few of our present workers have enjoyed that thorough training in *mental* as well as physical science, which is necessary to enable men even of great powers to take large and lofty views of the scheme of nature. Hence, we often find men who are fair workers in limited departments, reasoning most illogically, taking narrow and local views, elevating the exception into the rule. . . . Such defects certainly mar much of the scientific work now being done. In the more advanced walks of scientific research, they are to some extent neutralized

by that free discussion which true science always fosters ; though even here they sometimes vexatiously arrest the progress of truth, or open floodgates of error which it will require much labor to close. But in public lectures and popular publications they run riot. To launch a clever and startling fallacy, which will float for a week and stir up a hard fight, seems almost as great a triumph as the discovery of an important fact or law."¹ A deeply significant summary of all we have been saying may be found in that very ancient text : *Scientia inflat*.

NOTES OF A CATHOLIC TOURIST IN CENTRAL EUROPE.

THERE are many objects of interest which escape the notice of most tourists, even in the well-trodden fields of central Europe. Amongst those more apt to be neglected by the multitudes of Englishmen and Americans who meet there so constantly, are those connected with the faith of their common Catholic ancestors. Sectarian prejudice has made many Englishmen so ignorant on the subject that they often fall into the grossest errors respecting the beliefs and practices of the countries they visit. Americans, whose home is necessarily devoid of mediæval remains, might be expected to be generally indifferent to relics and survivals of such old days. Nevertheless the keen interest they have displayed when their attention has been called to matters of the kind, has often surprised us. We are thus led to think that not only the Catholic readers of the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW*, but also no small number of non-Catholics may feel interest in these wayside notes. They refer to matters which we have not found elsewhere recorded, and mainly relate to matters ecclesiastical ; thus we venture also to offer a few practical hints for the comfort of those who may follow in our track.

We left London for Basle on June 17th, to anticipate the rush of summer migrants and to be in time to enjoy that prodigal display of Swiss wild flowers which precedes the mowing of its fields ; sleeping at Dover enabled us to embark leisurely for Calais and to secure a rightly directed coupé for the night journey *via* Laon. Let travellers who may wish, as we did, to ride face forwards, be

¹ *Story of the Earth and Man*, ch. 13.

careful to start in that direction, as the train reverses almost directly after starting, as well as again on quitting Boulogne. Many tourists are tempted to go, at Basle, to the celebrated inn of the three kings so charmingly situated on the bank of the Rhine. On a previous visit, however, we found its arrangements to be sadly unsanitary, and therefore preferred on this occasion to go to the Euler, close to the railway station, ready for an early start the following day. The noble old cathedral, though still devoted to Protestantism, has yet been cleansed and restored and made ready for better things. Meanwhile there is a fine new Catholic church, a solid, cruciform building, round-arched, with two handsome columns on either side dividing the nave from the aisles. It is rich with mural paintings and stained glass, but there is a singular absence of statuary. The next day was passed at the Bernerhof at Berne, rooms on the south side of which should always be secured, whence, weather permitting, a charming view of the snowy mountains of the Oberland is to be obtained.

The capital of Switzerland we found still presenting that painful evidence of the tyrannical injustice of European "liberals," the withholding from the Catholics of the church built by their own alms, and the handing of it over to that newest of all sects, the "Old" Catholics. We wish no evil to the members of that sect, though in just one respect we would have them less "free." We wish they would not make "free" with the property of other people. Of all the inconsistent forms of belief, it is difficult to imagine another so inconsistent as that of an "Old Catholic." In order to find a parallel to it, it would be necessary to meet with a "free-thinker" who based his freethinking exclusively on authority.

Our experience induces us to advise the traveller proceeding to Interlaken to do as we did; that is, after reaching Thun by rail, to hire a carriage to drive thence along the new road on the north side of the lake. It is a charming drive, by taking which the tedium of the steamboat with its many stoppages is avoided, and finer glimpses of scenery are obtained than any which can be had from the lake's surface.

We found Interlaken crowded for the termination of a shooting match, and were pleased to find the various provincial peasant costumes in much fuller use than we had ever hoped to see again.

The ancient convent church, at the east end of Interlaken, is in a sad condition. Its apsidal sanctuary is given up for Anglican worship, and part of the building, to the south, to the Presbyterians. The nave has been divided by a horizontal partition which forms both the roof of a cellar and the floor of an "upper chamber" which serves as the Catholic chapel. Here a priest sent from Basle said Mass daily at eight o'clock, and on Sunday Mass with a sermon

was at nine. The altar was ornamented in a sadly tasteless way with artificial flowers, plaster angels and a multitude of candlesticks. At the nine o'clock Mass on Sunday there was no singing, but a ceaseless "twiddling" on the harmonium, continually holding out hopes of a lapse into silence and continually disappointing them. The priest, however, gave an excellent sermon on the holiness of and the graces received by St. John the Baptist—it being the feast of his nativity. The church was not half full, and the priest informed us that during the "season" the Catholics are very remiss in their church attendance. We do not, of course, refer here to the sights of the vicinity, which were duly visited, but it may be useful for some readers to know that, by securing a return landau, the drive to Lucerne may be done for fifty francs. We left the Victoria Hotel at Interlaken at 8 A.M., and reached the door of the Sweizerhof at Lucerne at 5 P.M. Travellers should be careful not to hire a carriage which cannot be entirely closed, for the sudden and heavy showers of such mountain regions are not to be lightly regarded. This drive by Brienz and over the Brienz pass will soon be performed but rarely, as the railway has been completed since our visit. Those who go by it will lose much; for the aspects of nature far and near are most charming, while the handiworks of man beside the road are by no means devoid of interest. Nowhere do we know more characteristic "Swiss cottages" than those passed along the road between Interlaken and Brienz—namely, of Riggensberg, Niederried and Oberried. The mode in which the bees are kept seems a strange one. We saw a horizontal row of hives high up in front of the houses, as if they acted on a maxim that "every bed-room should have its own bee-hive."

It is a refreshing change to pass from Berne into the Catholic canton of Unterwalden, where, after lunching at Lungern, the travellers by carriage road should be sure to pull up at Sachseln to see its fine church, built in 1672, which contains the shrine and some relics of St. Nicholas of Flue—a local saint who lived at about the middle of the fifteenth century and whose painted image is to be seen on all sides in the cantons of Unterwalden and Lucerne. He was a countryman with a wife and large family. When his children were grown up and settled, he, with his wife's consent, retired to a hermitage where he passed the remainder of his life. St. Nicholas was born at Sachseln. The church contains twenty-two marble columns and several fine altars. The saint is represented in prayer on his marble shrine. Beside the church is a chapel containing the old tomb of the saint with a number of *ex votos*. At Sarnen, the capital of Unterwalden, there is a large church, a nunnery and a Capuchin friary. It is a clean and pleasant looking place, where every Catholic tourist should pause and thence

proceed to visit the charming and far-famed Engelberg with its venerable Benedictine monastery. From Sarnen the road for the most part skirts the lake to Lucerne which, with its quaint, well-known, wooden bridges, is a delight to the lover of art as well as to the lover of nature. The old collegiate church, with its twin western spires, has its Renaissance altars and bas-relief reredos profusely gilded, and its choir enclosed by an iron rood-screen with an altar in its midst. More interesting than the church, which was sadly dirty, is the cloister-bounded cemetery in which it stands—a sort of “Campo santo.” The graves and monuments were bright with flowers, and we noticed a wreath of roses freshly placed upon the monument of one who was born in 1799 and who died in 1839. A stone holy-water stoop, with its brush, was placed in every third interspace of the cloister pillars. The last Mass is at half-past nine, and we attended the ordinary week-day vespers with half-a-dozen strangers. The native congregation was represented by one pious lady with two small boys, but she did not seem to follow the service.

There were eight canons who came into the church singly through different doors ready veiled for the office. One came provided with an umbrella which he took with him to the choir. The day was threatening. Each wore a cotta with many vertical plaits, with a cloth tippet over the shoulders. The sacristan lighted six candles on the rood-screen and two on the altar. Then sixteen choir-boys entered processionally, each with a cotta reaching only to his waist, but with no cassock so that the dirty trousers of each boy were conspicuous beneath his short white vesture. Only every alternate verse of the hymn or magnificat was sung, a twiddling on the organ taking the place of the others, as also of various anti-phones, versicles and responses. No incense was used at the “Magnificat.”

We next day visited the Capuchin Friary (near the well-known Lion monument, but higher up the hill), and were greatly struck with the order and perfect cleanliness of the little church—a great contrast to all those of the city below. A friar told us there were ten fathers and fourteen novices.

On the 25th of June we started for Andermatt, going by train to Erstfeld, where we had ordered a carriage to meet us, that we might continuously enjoy the scenery of the lovely valley of the Reuss, instead of burrowing through its flanks by the railway to Göschenen. We halted to enjoy a very simple, but very excellent, lunch at the Hotel des Alpes, Wassen. This is a charming spot, where anyone not objecting to somewhat rough living might stay and economize, as he would be taken in to board and lodge for thirty-five francs a week! At Göschenen we saw the northern mouth of the

long St. Gothard tunnel. Thence the ascent to our destination, Andermatt, was both continuous and steep, but we had, unfortunately, to mount it and cross the famed "Devil's Bridge" in rain and fog, and we gladly entered our snug quarters at the Belle Vue Hotel. Andermatt has some botanical interest. One finds a charming little yellow pansy in its fields, and a plant with a very large flower (*Saxifraga cotyledon*) on the banks near the Devil's Bridge (we were told by the director of the botanic gardens at Zurich) not found elsewhere in Switzerland; while a curious pine has a habit of growth which makes it look as if it has been blown almost to the ground.¹

The Belle Vue Hotel is large and commodious, but not cheap. The windows of our room commanded the valley as far as Hospenthal, the first village met with coming over the St. Gothard from Italy.

After a slight refecation we strolled out to see the rough and somewhat dismal-looking, though picturesque, village. We were struck with the attractive appearance of the small inn named "Les Trois Rois," charmingly situated on the right bank of the swiftly-rushing Reuss. Our first visit was, of course, to the church and clergy house, and we were directed to a small, white cottage, beside the door of which was a chain with a small cross as bell handle. We asked for the parish priest, and were shown upstairs, where, to our surprise, we saw three Capuchins at their evening meal of cake and cream. They were neither tonsured nor sandalled, and their dwelling was not reckoned as a true friary, but what they called a hospitium. Their monastic home is at Altdorf. They told us that the parish of Andermatt had been under the care of the Capuchins for two hundred years. The last Mass on Sundays and great festivals is at a quarter past eight, which Mass we attended the next day, that being the feast of SS. Peter and Paul. The church was a large and handsome structure, and very different in aspect from what would be found in most English villages of so small a size. All the richness and brightness of Andermatt seemed to be there, as was doubtless the case in an English village before the "Reformation." The long and spacious sanctuary was raised six feet; the altar, with a redos of three superimposed pictures rising to the roof and successively diminishing in size, each being framed at the sides by three twisted columns of light blue, surrounded with spiral gilded wreaths. There were two other altars, one on each side of the chancel arch, and two more on either side of the nave. There was no rood-screen, but a rood, with SS. Mary and John, is suspended in the chancel arch, the figure of our Lord very ensanguined, with a

¹ Is this a condition produced by local circumstances which has become inherited?

"sacred heart" at the foot of the cross. The font stood at the side of the chancel arch. The nave was filled by carved wooden seats, clean and well-dusted.

At Mass the females were on the Gospel side. The first five benches were reserved for children, then came clergy on the male side, and some sisters on the other. Behind these were the laity. Although it was so great a feast, there was no deacon or sub-deacon, but only five serving lads, each in a scarlet cassock, cut up the middle behind and with a cape; cassock and cape being bordered with silver lace, and a red sash round the waist was tied in a large bow. The choir was represented by one male singer in the western organ-gallery, who only sang fragments of the "Gloria" and "Creed." Each "Amen" was singularly prolonged, lasting quite as long as the "*et cum spiritu tuo*." After saying the "*Oremus*" and the "Offertory," the candles were extinguished, and the priest left the sanctuary, coming down to sit with the others in the nave. Then followed a very long sermon divided into four portions, separated by a very long pause, during which an almost universal nose-blowing took place.

Mass being resumed, some ten or a dozen women in deep mourning rose just before the "Preface" and walked processionally up to a side altar, upon which each in turn deposited an offering. The "Benedictus" was not sung till after the "*Pax Domini*," etc., and the "Agnus Dei" immediately followed it. The "Ite missa est" was spun out almost to the length of a "Pater noster." The collection was made after the "Agnus Dei" by the master of the ceremonies, who wore a short cotta, but no cassock, which had a most absurd and undignified appearance while he was assisting the priest at the altar. There was a large and devout congregation, though there had been several earlier Masses. The men about us knelt the whole time except during the Gospel and the sermon.

At vespers all was sung in the organ loft, one priest in surplice and stole standing before the altar during the "Magnificat," and no incense was used. After the blessing, the priest went quickly to the sacristy, and, returning with brush and holy water, walked down the middle of the church sprinkling the people. The congregation again knelt the whole time after the psalms.

At the village of Hospenthal the church was smaller than that of Andermatt, but otherwise very similar to it.

The weather being much too severe to warrant our continuing our journey as we had intended (by Dissentis, Ilanz, and Thusis to Pontresina), we retreated north to Zurich. We took up our abode at the Hotel Baur au Lac, whence from our room on the third floor (there is a lift) we had occasionally a surprisingly fine view of the distant snowy mountains.

After a day's rest we started on a visit to the celebrated sanctuary of Einsiedeln. This vast Benedictine monastery, of very ancient foundation, was rebuilt in the last century. It consists of four huge quadrangles, in the midst of which is the large church. It is but twelve minutes' walk from the railway station on the further side of the little town, made up mainly of restaurants and shops of "*objets de piété*," to supply the mundane and pious requirements of the multitudes of pilgrims who annually visit the place. We made our way straight to the abbot's quarters, where (having sent in our letters of introduction) we were courteously received by Abbot Basilius, the fifty-first abbot of the house, whose brother is Vicar-Apostolic of Dakota in the United States. He confided us to the care of a father (who was the cellarius) to show us over the monastery and church. There were 87 Religious who were priests, of whom 40 were absent either in charge of parishes, giving missions, or doing other spiritual work. Of those in residence—which included a dozen lay brothers—the greater number were occupied about the abbey school, which contained 170 lads who were boarders and about 75 day-scholars. There were 32 lay brothers and 7 novices. The library was of moderate size, considering that it contained, we were told, 29,000 printed books with a few MSS.

The church is a curious, very ornate structure built round the small marble sacellum, wherein is enshrined the venerated image of the place, which is towards the western end of the nave, at the east end of which is a large sanctuary, high up and behind the high altar of which is the monk's choir. There is no clerestory, but a large gallery which runs round the church and which is entered from within the monastery. There is a low dome over the nave in front of the sanctuary. The ornaments are very rococco, with a profusion of painted and gilded stucco, sprawling figures on the roof in very high relief with legs hanging down, and cherubs which one fears may one day fall on the heads of worshippers.

There are two High Masses every day—a conventual Mass at 5.30 A.M. and one in the sacellum at 7.13, except on Sundays and feasts, when the second Mass is about 9 A.M.

We were told that only about from 10 to 15 fathers were free to attend choir. The monks have no sort of tonsure, but (unlike those of Austria) wore a hood and a cowl in church. They rise at 4.30, dine at 11. No monk has more than one room, and even the abbot has but two. We were not shown the refectory, and were told that it was against the rules of the Swiss Benedictine monasteries for any stranger to enter it. We were offered no sort of refreshment—a quite novel experience in our monastic

visits. This was, perhaps, on account of the multitude of restaurants in the town.

The abbeys and other religious houses of Switzerland must be regarded as survivals, since by the present constitution of the republic no new ones can be founded. Thus, even the Catholic cantons are not allowed to do as they like in this respect—surely, a most glaring example of the false conception of freedom which is entertained in Continental Europe. What would be thought in England or America if a dozen or two of men of independent means were not allowed to club together and live in common, wearing dressing gowns of the same pattern, and binding themselves to pass every afternoon in reading Shakespeare, to abstain from pumpkin pie every Tuesday, and never to drink any wine but Madeira, should it be their wish and pleasure to agree thus to bind themselves?

We attended Vespers, which were sung at 3 P.M. They would have been very nice but that the choir behind the high altar was so far away that the service could only be most imperfectly heard. Only four candles were lighted on the altar, no incense was used at the "Magnificat," and the organ played in the place of each repeated antiphon. After Vespers, 18 students and 22 monks came down, processionally, to the Sacellum, and there sang the "Salve."

Before quitting Zurich, we visited its Botanical Garden, which, although kept in a somewhat slovenly fashion, is interesting to the Swiss tourist, from its collection of Alpine plants.

Our next visit was to Constance, where we took up our abode in the old Dominican monastery, now the Insel Hotel, part of its ancient church now serving as the restaurant. Our windows commanded a lovely view over the lake of Constance, with the Vorarlberg in the distance. The morning after we arrived being Sunday, we started early to visit the churches, a hasty glance at which we had taken the evening before. We soon came upon a regiment on its way to St. Stephen's, and we followed them to assist at the military Mass. The soldiers nearly filled the church, and their services and recollected demeanor were most edifying. All that the benches would hold knelt. The rest stood. No helmets were worn, save by those on guard at each door, and, altogether, the contrast was great with what we recollect to have been the behavior of French soldiers at their "church parade." The services were long; a service and a High Mass, during which the soldiers sang in German. Instead of the bell, drums were beaten, and a roll of the drum preceded the reading of the Gospel. The service concluded with the three prayers: the first for the Pope, the second for the Emperor, and the third for the Grand Duke of Baden.

We next went to the Cathedral, being, we thought, in excellent

time to get places. But we found the edifice thronged to listen to a sermon, which seemed endless, and was followed by a long prayer in German; then other German prayers, said alternately by priest and people, and then a very prolonged announcement of services to come, and other church notices, so that this part was not over till more than a quarter of an hour after the time when the High Mass ought to have begun. A very civil beadle, with red gown, cap and staff, managed, with great difficulty, to find a place for the weakest of our party. The others had to stand the whole time with very many natives, for whom also there were no places. The congregation behaved reverently. The music was good and not florid. There was no deacon or sub-deacon, and the celebrant sang the Epistle as well as the Gospel. During the singing of the "Credo" the priest went on with the Offertory—a mode of celebration we never saw before.

The Cathedral is but of scant interest as an edifice, but the following points may be noted. The pillars of the nave are of the eleventh century, and monolithic, and their capitals extend beyond the narrow arches superimposed on them. The aisles are Gothic, their vaulting being supported in part by pilasters opposed to the columns of the nave. Each of the side chapels is inclosed within an iron screen, and at the west end is a very handsome Renaissance open gallery, and beside it a gigantic old fresco of St. Christopher. Beneath the sanctuary is a small crypt, and north of it is a chapel, with an *alto relievo* of the death of the Blessed Virgin Mary, painted, and also an elaborate Gothic winding-stair. The modern stained glass is very hideous, and over the chancel arch is a gigantic grand-ducal crown. The Augustinian church is given up to the "Old" Catholics, though there are exceedingly few of them. In the earlier morning of Sunday the shops remained shut, but towards midday they were nearly all open.

The almost incessant rain (which has raised the lake higher than it had been known to be for forty years) forbade our contemplated trip to the Abbey of Reichenau, wherein is the tomb of the Emperor Charles the Fat, whose deposition occasioned the rise of the existing powers of western Europe. A good band, in the hotel garden, helped to while away the tedium of our imprisonment, nor was the cookery to be despised, or the Meersburger-amlese wine. The rain continuing forced us to renounce the pleasure of steaming across the lake to Bregenz, and compelled us to go by rail, with the changes of train, one at Rorschach, and the other at St. Margarethen, at which latter place the nominal inspection of our baggage by courteous Austrian officials was gone through. The view of the Rhine Valley towards Feldkirche, as the line turns northwards towards Brienz, is very fine. On arriving, we went to the *Öesterreicher*

Hof, a good hotel, save that it is rather too near the railway for quiet comfort. We soon sally out to view the picturesque old town, and, happening to meet a Capuchin priest, ascend to see his convent and chapel. The latter was very clean, with a somewhat elaborate altar, which was served by a lay-brother. There were nine fathers, who wore neither tonsure nor sandals. The parish church, situated in the rear of the convent, is large and handsome, but very rococco. A deep ravine separates this part of the town from the rest. Bregenz is charmingly situated, and a country residence on one of the mountain slopes in the vicinity has, to our knowledge, been found very enjoyable and satisfactory.

The morning after our arrival, we drove out to visit the Abbey of Mehreran. It was a deserted Benedictine house, and has been occupied by Cistercians, who were expelled from Switzerland by energetic "liberals." These sons of St. Bernard consist of fifty priests, forty lay-brothers, besides novices, while a school with 126 boarders is attached to the abbey. The monks' refectory was very simple, and their cloister was provided with stalls all round it. The old Abbey church having been destroyed, they have built a new one which, though architecturally inferior (a large quasi-Gothic hall), is yet a fine thing in its way, for it is lined throughout with beautifully painted decorations, done by a lay-brother, who has shown himself to be an artist of no small skill, and one animated by the same sentiments as those which guided the pencil of Fra Angelico. A small cloister, leading from the church to the convent, was especially remarkable for its devotional paintings. How often religion seems to inspire this power!

The following day we proceeded to the Bavarian city of Lindau. This six miles' journey is almost always performed by rail, but we preferred a carriage-drive. On shortly reaching the Bavarian frontier, our Jehu vainly endeavored to arouse the custom-house official, who was evidently indulging in a post-prandial siesta. At last we saw a movement within, which was the functionary struggling with his uniform. The task accomplished, he appeared evidently much impressed by the unwonted sight of a travelling carriage, and, with a profound bow, asked if the "Herrschaften" had anything to declare. The Herrschaften replying they had not, with another profound bow, we resumed our pleasant drive, which, when we ceased to skirt the lake of Constance, took us through meadows full of wild flowers and blue with those of a tall orchid.

Lindau should be visited. It is an agreeable city, charmingly situated, and we found comfortable quarters at the Bayerischer Hof.

We had a charming view from our windows of Bregenz and all the country we had left, including the gorge of the Rhine Valley,

with its mountain boundaries, while busy steamers were going and coming from the quay in front of our hotel.

Lindau is a mainly Catholic city, and yet, under the Catholic government of this Catholic country, the Lindau Catholics fare but badly. A magnificent old church stands desecrated, and there are but two churches, which stand side by side. One, Catholic, and open all day; the other, Protestant, and closed. The Catholic children, by themselves, fill the Catholic church entirely, so that a cry of insufficient church accommodation is, indeed, justified.

Next day, we started for Munich, a journey which, as usual, we performed in a carriage to ourselves, and which would have been thoroughly enjoyable but for clouds and rain, which sadly marred our view of the Tyrolese Alps. To be conveniently placed in the heart of Munich, it is well to go to the Bayerischer Hof, but, certainly, for no other reason. After our journey, however, we gladly took up our abode there. Next morning, our first visit was to the adjacent Cathedral, the round-topped twin towers of which are visible for many a mile around. It was Thursday, and we found that on that day there is always a High Mass and Procession of the Holy Sacrament, which was proceeding as we entered. The congregation was large, and the music very grave and solemn. It was thirty years since we last visited this city, and we were delighted with the improvement effected in the venerable Cathedral by the late Archbishop, and it is, to our mind, decidedly the most devotional church in Munich, far more so than the Basilica of St. Boniface or any other of the much-vaunted modern structures. Its lofty aisles, as high as the nave, separated by image-bearing pillars which melt into the groined roof above without capitals, are very noble.

Our next experience was a singular commercial one. We carried a letter of credit for the principal European cities, addressed to Bloch & Co., and also to the Bayerischer Bank, in Munich. On presenting it at Messrs. Bloch's, the following colloquy ensued: "But I have had no advice of this from your bankers." "Of course not. Messrs. ——— cannot send special advices to all their correspondents in Europe about every letter they give their clients." "How am I to know you are the person named?" "There is my signature on the letter, and I will write another for you to see." "We must have more than that." "Here is my card-case with a lot of my cards in it." "That will hardly do." "Here is my foreign-office passport." "A passport might do, but this is not a new one." "No, but observe my name printed on its leather case. Here also is a letter of introduction just written by Cardinal Manning." "Pardon us, but all these things might have been picked up. Can you bring any resident in Munich who knows you?" "I can bring an official who has known me for thirty years." "Bring him with

you this afternoon, and we will honor your letter of credit." Amazed and disgusted we went to the Bayrischer Bank: "Will you give me fifty pounds on this letter of credit?" "Of course; how will you have it?" The moral of this contrast is obvious: "Go not to Bloch & Co!"

At Munich, as at various other cities, we met with the modern nuisance of "International Exhibitions," making a visit to its picture gallery obligatory. We were amazed to see some very curious portraits of Gladstone. There were also many of Döllinger, and one very terrible one of the late unfortunate King Ludwig II. Clad in royal robes and grasping his sword, his countenance was so wonderfully wild and savage that its image haunted one of us for days. The two pictures which charmed us most were an Italian interior, marvellously realistic, called "In the Kitchen," by Gaetano Chierici, and a Spanish picture by José Alcazar Tojedor, representing a first Mass. It is a custom on such occasions for the priest after he has finished to sit in a chair in the sanctuary, that the congregation may come to kneel and kiss the hands that have just offered up the Holy Sacrifice for the first time. This large picture represents the interior of a stately Spanish church; the priest seated, his back to the altar, with the various assistants on either side. His peasant parents have come to salute him, and his kneeling mother is taken into her son's arms, who is kissing her toilworn cheek, while the father stands, overcome by emotion, at her side.

We next renewed our acquaintance with the modern Benedictine Abbey of St. Boniface, and with our good friend Father Gregory Rossi, no less amiable and obliging now than when we first made his acquaintance, then in 1857. But the state of the abbey, we found, had become much more trying to its inmates, for their parish had enormously increased as to its population, whilst the number of religious had diminished. They were reduced to twelve priests and were greatly in want of novices. Their High Mass was exceedingly impressive with solemn music.

Each monk is allowed to furnish his cell in his own way, through money received from friends. The library contains 20,000 volumes. Matins are said at 6 A.M., and all the office is now recited in monotone; thirty years ago it was sung. The monks rise at 4 and go to bed at 9, and they abstain two days each week.

At the Cathedral we found that no office or capitular Mass was said or sung during the months of June, July, and August, which period is the canon's vacation. Of course, there were Vespers for the people on Sundays at 3. At St. Michael's (the old church of the Jesuits) the music is very ornate, with a full orchestra, and a great crowd assembles to hear it. At the students' church, Mass is said at 9, and none but students go in beyond the iron screen

near the west end. We saw no students either genuflect or kneel. At the Cathedral Vespers we found a priest and two cantors in shabby copes. The altar was incensed during the singing of the Antiphon and before the "Magnificat." The altar of the Blessed Sacrament was not incensed. There was a fair congregation. After the "Salve," the Blessed Sacrament was carried to the high altar and a blessing given with it. Then a priest ascended the pulpit and said the Rosary, which was followed by the Litany of the B. V. M. and various prayers. Then the Blessed Sacrament was again incensed, but neither the "Tantum Ergo" nor anything else was sung, but Benediction given at once, after which the Host was carried back to the altar behind the choir. After this came a sermon, at the beginning of which we left. We then paid a short visit to Salzburg, where we stayed, at the conveniently situated Hotel d'Autriche, having previously found the more magnificent Hotel de l'Europe so inconveniently remote from the city. The sights of this city and the excursion to Königsee are so well known that we will only make one or two remarks. The drive to Berchtesgaden has been somewhat spoiled by the carrying of a steam tramway half-way there; it has great charms, nevertheless. Soon after passing the new cemetery we came upon an open wood full of orchids, campanulas, mulleins, and other beautiful wild flowers. The chapter house of the old Augustinian church, at Berchtesgaden, has a single row of columns running along its middle—like many an old refectory. Here, during the season, Protestant worship is carried on. The churches and cloisters are well worth a visit, though few tourists stop to see them. The weather continuing extremely unfavorable, we determined to leave and go direct to Augsburg, which ancient and venerable city we reached on the evening of Saturday, July 21st, taking up our abode at the historic house of the "Three Moors," although the old mediæval hostelry has been long since rebuilt. It is a magnificently spacious and solid building. The first church we visited, at half-past six on Sunday morning, was that of St. Ulrich—a large and graceful edifice, in the middle-pointed style. As it had for a considerable time been (as had all the other churches in Augsburg) a Protestant church, none of its pious imagery, with which it was replete, was older than the 17th (or very late 16th) century. The high altar, and also two altars right and left of the chancel arch, had each a reredos in extremely high relief and profusely gilt and painted. The effect is certainly rich and striking. A series of chapels (chantries, etc.), of different dates ran along the Epistle side of the nave, each being enclosed with its wrought-iron screen of corresponding date to the chapel it enclosed—a very interesting collection. In front of the Epistle side of the chancel-arch was a sunken chantry chapel of a bishop; a short flight of steps leading

down to it. The chapel itself was rococco, but it contained a fine early Renaissance monumental figure. On the Gospel side of the nave was another chantry with a marble figure of a warrior all enclosed in a metal-work screen. The lofty pillars of the church were devoid of capitals. There was a small altar in the nave, in front of the middle, enclosed only by Communion rails. Here the Blessed Sacrament was reserved, and to it people came up for Holy Communion.

We next visited the Cathedral, which has an ancient, low, early-pointed nave and a lofty eastern choir of the latest Gothic style. At the west end of the nave is another choir and altar of later date than the nave, but more ancient than the eastern choir. Besides a number of lateral chapels, there is an altar against almost every pillar of the nave. The Blessed Sacrament was reserved at a chapel on the Epistle side of the nave, and Benediction with the ciborium was given after Low Mass.

On coming out of the Cathedral we encountered a Benedictine monk. He told us that his house in Augsburg, which dates from 1806, contained twenty-five fathers. They have an orphanage with about seven hundred children. After returning to our hotel for breakfast, we went to hear High Mass at St. Ulrich's. On our way there we looked into the Protestant place of worship, which is formed of part of the building of St. Ulrich's. It was a quadrangular hall with a gallery all round, and was crowded with a sitting congregation all singing heartily together. The Communion table had its crucifix and two lighted candles, as usual in Lutheran places of worship.

At St. Ulrich's it was impossible to find a seat. High Mass was sung in the choir, while Low Mass proceeded at the small Communion altar in front of it, with the ciborium exposed. There was a full band, but no deacon, sub-deacon, or incense.

Strangers should drive, as we did, all about and around the city, which is picturesque and interesting, with its old gates and walls, and the curious "Fuggerei," a little walled-in town within the city, with several narrow streets and its own church.

In the Jacobstrasse we found a fair going on, with a multitude of people, amongst whom were many peasants, male and female, in picturesque costumes.

Our next halting-place was Ulm; well worth stopping at, not only on account of its Cathedral,—now used for Lutheran worship,—but on account of its picturesque streets of houses with high-pitched roofs and gables towards the street. The tower of the Cathedral we found was being rapidly surmounted by a tall spire, the erection of which (like that of Cologne Cathedral) was arrested by the anti-Christian movement misnamed the Reformation. Two new low towers, with spires, have been built beside

the sanctuary. The stalls are very elaborate. Those on the Gospel side are decorated with figures of the distinguished men of Heathendom, Jewry, and Christendom, from Pythagoras to Copernicus; the stalls on the Epistle side being similarly decorated with female figures. At the west end of one series of stalls is a figure of the carver of the stalls, and one of his wife on the west end of the other series. We stayed here at the Hotel de Russie, because it was so near the station. We found the living excellent and the beds exceptionally comfortable.

The next day we journeyed pleasantly to Stuttgart in a carriage by ourselves. The line is very pretty about Gippengen, where there is a sharp descent between rocky hills, a wide plain looking like a sea being visible at intervals in the distance.

At Stuttgart we went to the Hotel Marquardt, which is much to be commended. The city was, to us, formal and uninteresting, being almost entirely devoid of mediæval remains. Here we fell into a mistake which might also be made by other Catholic travellers. Close to the hotel is a plain, ugly church, with a simple cross above its front, which we were told was the "Old Catholic Church." It turned out to be not, as we had rashly supposed, the conventicle of the "Old Catholics," but simply the elder of the two Catholic churches now existing in the city. The more recently built one—the Marienkirche—is a handsome structure, with two imposing western towers and spires. It has no clere-story, lofty pillars supporting a groined roof of the same height throughout. Catholics have by no means full freedom in Stuttgart—no female religious daring to wear a habit. The only mediæval church we saw—the Stiftskirche—was in a very late, debased, Gothic style, and presented no objects which appeared to us interesting.

On leaving Stuttgart we went direct to Cologne, very comfortably in a carriage to ourselves. The road is generally but little interesting, except where the Vosges mountains appear in the distance across the great plain whereon stands Speyer. After leaving Darmstadt, the Taunus range comes into view. The Rome of the North, "Colonia," is a city too familiar to all travellers to permit many words to be here written about it. Yet it is such a mine of Christian architecture (to the study of which a lifetime might be well devoted) that we think a few notes on its older churches may be welcome. Probably the least interesting of all its mediæval churches is its far-famed Cathedral—majestic as it unquestionably is. Its interior effect is, however, ruined by its sad stained glass (of the Munich kind), without brilliancy. Of the many interesting churches in the German Gothic style, the traveller should not omit to visit that solemn one named St. Mary of the Capitol;

nor should any one of English race fail to make a pilgrimage to the remote little church of St. Mary, wherein he will find a shrine professing to contain the relics of St. Alban, protomartyr of England.

Amongst the features which mark many of the old churches of the city may be mentioned their very short apsidal chancels, crypts—eastern or western in position—with martyrs' tombs (evidently a fashion directly derived from Imperial Rome), and very extensive western porches, each like a transept at the west end. The Church of the Apostles (in the round-arch style) has its short choir and transepts, each with an apsidal termination. St. Columba's church is a debased Gothic building, singularly wide, with double aisles and galleries over the external ones, with a stone vaulting above as well as below each gallery. A remarkable peculiarity in this church is the construction of its southernmost aisle, which narrows gradually westward to accommodate the disposition of the street outside. This arrangement produces a singular effect in the vaulting in conjunction with that of the adjacent aisle, which is of the same breadth throughout. The Minorites' church, an early middle-pointed building, is remarkable for its massive columns, short in proportion to the arches they support, and the wall above which presents an extensive surface for fresco painting. In the elaborate Renaissance church, which formerly belonged to the Jesuits, the cassocks, rosary, and cross of Saints Francis Xavier, Ignatius, and Aloysius of Gonzaga were, and we believe are still, preserved. St. Gereon's church, one of the most interesting in Cologne, has a circular, or rather ten-sided, nave, surmounted by a dome, a choir with an apse extending from one side of the nave, much elevated and approached by a higher flight of steps, on either side of which is an entrance to the crypt. This interesting edifice suggests the idea that a magnificent church might be built from it as a model, with the addition of transepts and a nave; such a church, indeed, seems once to have enclosed within its area the pillar of St. Simon Stylites, in Syria. The small and very ancient little church of St. George has a singularly barbaric aspect from the unequal sizes and distances from each other of the pillars of its nave. St. Lambert's has an especial interest, from the fact that it was completed in the same year as that in which the Cathedral was begun, although the pointed arch makes but a scanty appearance here and there.

But our space is exhausted. Suffice it to say that on the weekday morning on which we left Cologne (July 25th) we found a High Mass proceeding in each church we visited. The city so long widowed of its bishop is again at peace. Long may piety and virtue flourish within its wide and rapidly increasing boundaries.

THE OBJECTIVITY OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE.

MANY are the systems of philosophy which have, within recent years, appealed to the thoughtful consideration of men. In every case the appeal has awakened a willing response; and the examination conducted by competent judges, with uniform courtesy and admirable forbearance, terminates with the verdict that they all contain a surprisingly small amount of truth, buried in a surprisingly large amount of error.

The source of all these errors is, no doubt, a profound ignorance of man's nature, the absence of a just appreciation of his capabilities and of his wants, which must necessarily eventuate in establishing gross materialism or inane idealism. Had half the energies employed in speculation been directed to a simple observation of realities, the increment to the general fund of knowledge would offer a better qualitative, if not quantitative, representation of the labor expended. Man being formed by a substantial union of soul and body, all the operations attributable to him as a member of the human species must bear the stamp of his nature. In common justice to the intelligence and wisdom of his Creator, who not only proposes to Himself an end in all that He does, but aptly disposes the means to a certain attainment of that end, he must recognize the inter-dependence of body and soul, the admirable correspondence between the sensations of the one and the affections of the other as an essential provision in the economy of the Divine plan. The body is the handmaid of the soul in supplying through sensation the materials upon which the intellect is to act; it is the medium which preserves intact our relations with the external world, and supplies the thousand and one truths which are categorized and verified by the understanding. If we isolate the soul in its operations, we elevate man to the order of pure intelligences and pronounce the body superfluous. On the first point, what is the testimony of conscience, and in the second case, how vindicate the wisdom of the Creator?

The subjectivism of Kant, which would make us the victims of appearances, is fundamentally a denial of the true nature of man; and here we have an *a priori* reason for rejecting the legitimacy of its conclusions, to which additional strength is added by the irresistible impulses of our nature. Indeed, philosophers may cavil as much as they please about the reality contained in our ideas; but when they return to practical life, their actions are at variance

with their theories, nature asserts her dominion once more, they become men instead of enthusiasts, and comport themselves as do their more humble brethren. After all, who would not rather be wrong with nature, if it must be so, than right with the philosophers?

Again, the same fundamental principle which, in the subjective order, underlies the criterion of consciousness and gives validity to its testimony, impels the intellect to advance still farther and to say that our ideas are not mere empty forms of the mind, pure phenomena succeeding one another without any thread of connection, launched like some mysterious craft upon the vast sea of thought, indicating neither whence they came, whither they tend, or why they are there. Were it so, then might we conclude with Carlyle: "Not our logical measurative faculty, but our imaginative one, is king over us, I might say priest and prophet, to lead us heavenward, or magician and wizard to lead us hellward. The understanding is thy window—too clear thou canst not make it: but phantasy is thy eye, with its color-giving retina, healthy or diseased."

No; our ideas present themselves as symbols, symbolizing something, as well accredited messengers giving adequate expression to the truth which they contain.

It is a strange fact that skeptics, relying upon consciousness, recognize the force of the principle of contradiction in the subjective order, and still refuse to admit its validity in the objective order, although incited and eventually constrained thereto by the necessity of their nature. Facts require witnesses, not proofs. And if we find ourselves irresistibly forced to the admission that we really experience certain modifications in our soul, so, also, are we under the inevitable necessity of believing that what appears to us is really as it appears. If we cannot prove the former (and we cannot), neither can we prove the latter; in both cases there is equal necessity. Hence, to discriminate where discrimination is inadmissible is to manifest a pernicious predilection in favor of one's own conceits, an arbitrary exclusiveness which, seeking a reason for everything and giving none for anything, would undermine the foundations of science by rendering the operations of the mind impracticable, make man a mystery to himself, and sap the root of morality—for surely this is the philosophism which says: "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." (*Hamlet*, Act II. Sc. 2.)

We have thus far strongly insisted upon the invincible necessity of our nature to accept the light of objective evidence manifesting itself subjectively; but we do not intend to thrust this fact as a homeless and helpless charge upon your charitable consideration. At this particular point of philosophic inquiry, the resources of reason have expended themselves, for we are now dealing with primitive facts of our nature. Should reason attempt to

go further, it transports itself beyond its proper element, and only succeeds in showing its own imbecility. However, we do not ingloriously abandon the field to skeptics, but draw upon arguments which, though indirect, are not the less apposite or cogent.

Those who find such insurmountable difficulties in admitting the connection of the idea with its object, speak very securely of subjective certitude. "We are not sure," they say, "that our ideas are more than illusive phantoms relatively to the external world, because reason is unable to prove the existence of any necessary connection between the subjective and the objective orders; but as for internal phenomena, conscience will not allow us to doubt of their reality. We are sure that we think, that we feel, and that we are cognizant of what takes place within us. But, pray, upon what grounds? If you reject entirely the objective order, the principle of contradiction fails; and in that case you are not sure that you think, that you feel, since you can at the same time both experience and not experience the same subjective modifications. Either, then, you are sure that you feel and think, or you are not. If you are, then you assert the existence of something objective; if you are not, then universal skepticism has the day.

The inference which we naturally draw from this argument is, that the subjective supposes the objective order, and is so entirely dependent upon it that both must stand or fall together. It is impossible to advance one step towards the acquisition of truth without attaching an objective value to our ideas, without supposing an objective truth in some judgments. Or, in the words of St. Thomas: "There are some truths in which there can be no appearance of error—as in the case of the axioms; wherefore, our intellect must assent to them." (Lib. 2 Sent., dist. 25, q. 1., a. 2, c.)

But there are other still more important phases of the question to be considered. Subjective certitude supposes that we have the consciousness of our own identity at various times, as also that the mind enjoys the power of reflecting upon itself. But if our ideas be deprived of their objectiveness, then are we in doubt as to our individual personality.

Consciousness is of present acts. When, therefore, we affirm that we are the same persons now that we were yesterday, the truth of the judgment is manifestly dependent upon our knowledge that the relation existing between the idea of what we were yesterday and the reality is identical with that existing between the present idea and its reality. In other words, the state of our existence in the past is presented to us by the idea which enters into the present act of consciousness, between which idea and its object there is, therefore, a perfect correspondence.

If, then, this relation be denied, your identity dissolves before your very eyes; you know not at any one moment whether you

be the same person that you were the moment before; you experience diverse acts taking place in your soul; but for you they are meaningless, because disconnected and out of sympathy with the necessities of your being. In arriving at this conclusion, we have shown that the validity of our judgments is based upon the correspondence of the idea with its object. If this adequation be wanting by reason of the non-existence of the object, all judgments are impossible. Judgments enter into ratiocination in quality of essential constituents. Consequently, if judgments be impossible, reasoning is at an end. Moreover, the human mind, being the lowest in the order of intelligences, acquires its knowledge not by intuitive perception, but by many successive judgments and reasonings; these being impracticable, thought itself must disappear from our midst. But not even the act of reflection, by which the mind makes itself the object of its own consideration, appears to be possible, for reflection is a second act which supposes a first or direct act bearing towards it the relation of object. Since, however, there is no such thing as objective truth, it follows that there can be no reflection. From what has been said, it is evident that in the event of such opinions obtaining general sway, the colossal edifice of science would find itself trembling to its very base; for not only is the legitimacy of man's faculties as criterions of truth questioned thereby, but the object of all science, which is the *nature of things*, and not our ideas, is destroyed. These are some of the consequences which follow in the train of subjectivism, and which, independently of the dictates of our natural reason, would be sufficient to make us revolt against doctrines so absurd, not to say pernicious. To the abnormal desire of subjecting all truths, even the most evident, to the touchstone of reason and to the conviction that in such a capacity reason had failed, is traceable the frenzy which possessed Berkeley with the determination of doubting everything. The quintessence of the philosophy of pure reason is contained in the epigrammatic verse:

" We are such stuff
As dreams are made of, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep."—(*Tempest*, Act IV. Sc. 1.)

But if we are appalled, and justly so, at the sight of the frightful destruction caused in the realm of intelligence by those who refuse to our ideas all objectiveness, what shall we say when we contemplate the results of their excursion into the sphere of morality, where the havoc is the more lamentable in that the interests involved are more important? We have seen the sensible and intellectual orders fade before the withering sophistry which thrives in doubt, and now we are called upon to witness the dissolution of the moral world. There are two kinds of intellectual pronounce-

ments: the one speculative, the other practical; both are equally evident, universal and necessary. The former are the fundamental principles of all rational science, the latter of all action. The former express the synthesis of what is, the latter of what is to be done and come under the denomination of moral principles. If asked their nature, we answer that they are manifestations of the infinite wisdom of God, defining the essential, and therefore necessary relations of things among themselves, and indicating to us, through the feeble light of reason, the means which must, without fail, lead us to our appointed end. They are laws, then, instituted for our direction as moral beings, and emanating from God, the Creator of our souls. Here, again, as in the case of intellectual principles, our understanding spontaneously yields to the force of immediate evidence, and pronounces them objective and real, since they have their reason of existence in the Divine essence. But we are told that there is no such thing as the real order. Then, away with all laws and principles, since, at best, they are utterly useless. Why should we be obliged to sacrifice our liberty by subjecting our will to certain rules of conduct, when they express but a combination of meaningless ideas, which have no binding force in themselves and whose observance or violation is attended with neither advantage nor disadvantage? The law supposes the existence of good and evil, since it enjoins the one and prohibits the other—but for us, good and evil are mere figments. What though there exist laws which tell us when we do good or evil? what though the words good and evil find a place in the vocabulary of all nations, thus proving a universal belief in their real existence? what though conscience keeps constant watch over all our actions, approving or reproving us according as we fulfil or prove faithless to our obligations? For us, good and evil have only a phenomenal existence, and can, therefore, command no influence over our conduct. The law also supposes a legislator who has the authority to promulgate it. But, how are we to know that such a being exists? Whether we infer His existence from the idea of the infinite with Descartes, from the existence of the moral law with Kant, or from the idea of necessary and contingent beings, of mover and moved, of primary and secondary efficient causes, with the scholastics, we are never sure that our idea corresponds to the reality unless we concede to it an objective value.

But you may say, although the intellectual order be involved in uncertainty, it is far otherwise with the moral order. Speculative reason teaches us nothing objective, but practical reason imposes an obligation which is both real and objective. To proceed after this manner is to evade rather than to solve the difficulty. At all events, such admissions must be attributed to the secret impulses of nature triumphing over sophistry, and to the conviction on the

part of subjectivists that without the real order there can be nothing but inextricable confusion. However, the distinction made between speculative and practical reason is gratuitous, for it rests on no proof of reason or fact of experience. In any case, it serves no purpose but to show the dilemma in which its author has succeeded in placing himself; for, according to the system which he has constructed, all truths, whether they pertain to the speculative or practical order, are only forms of the mind, and hence destitute of corresponding objects in the real order. Having in the beginning absconded from facts of experience and taught that the operations of the mind are to be explained *a priori*, he can never bridge over the gulf separating the objective from the subjective order. This must be evident from the manner in which he attempts to explain the origin of morality. He makes the moral worth of an action depend upon its obligatory character. But what imposes the obligation? Practical reason. Therefore practical reason, which we have shown to be entirely subjective, is the efficient cause of morality, which must likewise be subjective; and if morality be objective, it represents nothing fixed or determinate, but is liable to constant mutation, and, varying with each individual, may prove self-contradictory. What must be the character of the thoughts, the aspirations, the sympathies and the affections of a human heart when such a lax code is proposed to man as an effective means of developing the total capacities of his moral nature? In the depths of his soul he experiences only chagrin and disappointment, for his yearnings are after a nobler ideal. But his reason offers him no other, because it is unable to measure the infinity which is bound up in a human spirit, causing it to expand until it has attained the fruition of its object.

We have now arrived at the end proposed to ourselves. In taking a survey of the ground traversed, we must be convinced that there is no fact of our nature more immediately evident or supported by stronger proofs than that of the objective character of human knowledge. We have seen that wherever nature commands superiority—as in the duties of practical life—we necessarily refer our ideas to the reality; and, moreover, that when a different course is pursued, we destroy all intellectual and moral principles, undermine the foundation of even the subjective order, involve everything in obscurity, and ensure the permanent triumph of doubt. If this picture be frightful to contemplate, it is that presented by subjective philosophy when exposed in its true light. Yet it serves a good purpose in showing how empty must be all the cavils of skepticism when confronted by nature, and discourages pride of intellect by teaching our reason that it, as all things else, has a limit beyond which it may not go.

Scientific Chronicle.

COBALT, NICKEL, AND THEIR NEW ASSOCIATE.

As the determination of the atomic weights of the elements is of the greatest importance for the validity of many modern theories of chemistry, skilful experimenters have devoted themselves to researches on this subject. These researches are of great intrinsic value and interest, and although accuracy in the above determinations does not always reward their labors, still new and important discoveries are often the result of their patient investigations. Such, indeed, is the case before us. Cobalt and nickel have long been known as elements, and many attempts were made to determine their atomic weights, but without concordant results. Clemens Winkler decomposed gold chloride solution with known amounts of cobalt and nickel, and weighing the precipitated gold, obtained the equivalents of these elements in terms of gold. But as the atomic weight of this latter metal was not accurately known, the weights of nickel and cobalt thus deduced were not precise. Lately, however, Gerhard Krüss re-determined the atomic weight of gold with great accuracy, and resolved to repeat the method employed by Winkler. With the assistance of F. W. Schmidt, numerous experiments were made, which gave varying results. They obtained neither the figures previously given by Winkler nor those given by C. Zimmermann. The variations were too great to be accounted for by ordinary analytical errors, and hence the disturbing cause had to be looked for elsewhere. In washing gold that had been reprecipitated by sulphurous acid, the filtrate had a red color due to cobalt chloride. This color, however, disappeared after a time, and the wash-water became tinged with a slight greenish hue. On evaporation this green solution left a residue from which a chloride was obtained that differed from the chlorides of all the known elements. The same result was reached when nickel was employed instead of cobalt. This pointed out at once the disturbing cause in all previous investigations, and brought to light the existence of a previously unknown element. By careful manipulation, one gram of the oxide of the new metal was obtained from fifty grams of nickel oxide, and by drying the new chloride in an atmosphere of carbon dioxide and reducing it at a red heat, by means of hydrogen, the new metal was isolated. It is black, but when obtained in the shape of thin metallic scales has a brownish-black appearance. Electrolysis of the chloride also yields the metal. Thus, cobalt and nickel have all along been associated with this new metal, but the latter has been present in such small quantities as, heretofore, to escape detection. Cobalt and nickel are almost always found together in nature. Although the former

is mentioned by Basil Valentine, Paracelsus, and Agricola, still cobalt, as we know it, seems to have been discovered in 1742, by Brandt, and all previous use of the name was to indicate ores that did not contain this metal. Nickel was first mentioned by Hiarni, in 1694, but it was not until 1754 that it was definitely pointed out by Cronstedt. This latter metal has a silver-white lustre and is capable of receiving a very high polish. Moreover, it oxidizes only with great difficulty, and is, therefore, extensively used in the electro-plating industry. The bright appearance of our locks, keys, surgical instruments, etc., is due to a thin coat of this metal deposited on the iron by the aid of electricity. This electro-nickel-plating industry is carried on most extensively in this country. The discoverers of the new element are working on the atomic weights of cobalt, nickel, and the new metal, and we may expect to hear more about the latter in a short time.

ELECTRICAL RAILROADS.

THE application of electricity as a motive power is not new, but the rapid growth of this branch of electrical industry during the past year, especially in this country, cannot fail to attract attention. As the arc light is rapidly supplanting the feeble gas-lamp for illuminating our streets, and the glow-lamp the noxious gas flame in our private dwellings, so too the cheaper, more compact, and cleaner electric motor is superseding the steam-engine in our shops and manufactories. The more costly method of horse-traction, in use on our street railways, is being abandoned and some one of the systems of electric-traction is substituted in its place. This change has shown the evident superiority of the latter mode of traction, and brings up the question whether we cannot in the near future replace the steam locomotive by the electric motor. That electricity can economically replace horses, is shown by a glance at its rapid spread during the past year, while its universal adoption will depend on whether considerations of safety and æsthetics will allow the current to be economically conveyed to the cars. A glance at the following table will show the progress of the electric power industry during the six months from August, 1888, to February, 1889 :

	August, 1888.	February, 1889.
Electric street railways in operation,	34	53
Electric street railways building,	83	44
Electric street railways incorporated, but not yet contracted for,	39	42
Electric cars in operation,	223	378
Electric cars under contract; roads not yet finished, .	244	329
Miles of single track in operation,	138	294.5
Miles of single track under contract, not yet in operation,	189.5	273.75

The different systems of electric propulsion in use may conveniently be divided into two classes. In the first, the electricity is generated at a central station and conveyed thence by conductors, from which it is supplied all along the road to the motors attached to the cars. In the second, the car carries its own electric generator with it. The former class may be sub-divided into four, according to the methods adopted to convey the current from the central station to the various motors. They are, first, the overhead system; second, the third-rail system; third, the method which employs the two rails as conductors; and fourth, the underground conduit system. In the overhead system employed by the Sprague Co., the electricity is carried along a silicon-bronze wire $\frac{3}{8}$ ths of an inch in diameter. This wire is suspended 18 feet above the centre of the track by means of span wires that cross the street at every 125 feet. The span wires are supported by poles of very neat design. The return circuit is through the rails and the ground. A trolley, balanced from the roof of the car, runs along the silicon-bronze wire and conveys the current to the wires, which connect with the motor placed under the car, and in contact with the axle of the wheels. A similar system is employed by the Thomson-Houston Co. It has proved and continues to prove satisfactory. There is no danger to persons crossing the track as the wire carrying the current is out of reach, and hence all possibility of accidentally completing the circuit is precluded, except when the wire breaks and falls to the ground. But superior workmanship in the construction of these overhead wires removes uneasiness in this respect, for severe storms that during the past winter visited localities in which this system was in operation left the wires intact, when electric light, telegraph, and telephone lines were seriously disabled. In all these instances, too, the electric cars showed their efficiency by running on schedule time, when, in many cases, other methods of conveyance were suspended. The only serious objection to the adoption of this system in our large cities is the erection of poles in the streets and the running of overhead wires. In many cases, however, these poles are useful and ornamental, as in the case of the Washington road built by the Thomson-Houston Co. It is true the street is wide, and the poles, neatly furnished with cross pieces to support the trolley wire, are placed in the middle of the road. They carry the electric lamps, and thus remove the need of other lamp-posts. In the suburbs of our large cities, and in the smaller towns and cities, the above objection is not made, and here this method is chiefly used. The saving effected by its introduction may be gathered from some figures published in regard to the Richmond road, erected by the Sprague Co. The average cost for motive power per day for a horse car, that is, for from ten to eleven hours and trips of from 45 to 50 miles, was about \$4. This took into account only the horses on actual duty. With the electric system the cost per car for equal mileage is less than \$2, and the cost per car decreases with an increase in the number of cars.

The systems of employing either a third rail to carry the current or of

converting the two rails into conductors are objectionable on account of the continual danger to which citizens are exposed of receiving shocks when crossing the tracks. Moreover, there is a great loss of electricity due to leakage on account of the difficulty of maintaining proper insulation, and hence the current does a smaller amount of work in the motor. This last difficulty seems to have been overcome by an ingenious device in the Haus system, which has been shown lately in New York in a working model. Here one side of the track is made of 12 ft. rails. The current is carried by an insulated wire buried in the stringers under these rails, and each 12 ft. rail is in metallic contact with this wire. The circuit is completed by the car, so only that portion of the track on which the car rests is energized. Thus the great loss of electricity occasioned by using the insulated rails is prevented.

The fourth method of conveying the current from the central station is the Bentley-Knight system. A conduit is laid midway between the rails, and is firmly bolted to the stringers and sleepers. A cross-section of the conduit would be about one foot square. Copper bars an inch and a quarter thick, placed in this conduit, carry the current. In the upper side of the conduit there is a longitudinal slot $\frac{5}{8}$ ths of an inch wide. Thin iron plates about ten inches square, called "ploughs," hanging from the car, project into this slot and complete the circuit between the conducting bars in the conduit and the motor on the car. The first cost in this system is greater than in those already mentioned, while difficulties arise from want of proper drainage in the conduit and from insufficient insulation. Its introduction, however, shows that these difficulties are not insurmountable, and that the system is a practical one. It is adopted on Fulton Street, New York, and as a supplement to the Sprague overhead system, where the West End road runs through the crowded thoroughfares of Boston.

But in the second great method of electric locomotion, namely, in that in which the car carries its own electric generator, we seem to have found the ideal system. Here there is no danger from falling wires, as no overhead wires are employed, no danger to passengers crossing the track, since the rails do not carry an electric current, and hence no loss of electricity on account of insufficient insulation. If the electro-generator here employed were perfect, there would be no objection to the universal adoption of the storage battery system. Though of late many improvements have been made in these batteries, still much remains to be done. The Julien Electric Traction Co. is running surface cars on Fourth Avenue, New York, by means of storage batteries, and the results are very satisfactory. The batteries give back 80 per cent. of the watts received. A single car carries 120 cells of battery, each weighing 27 lbs., which with the weight of the trays and boxes add 3600 lbs. to the weight of the car. The load of an ordinary horse-car is three tons, so that one of these cars supplied with battery and motor weighs about $4\frac{3}{4}$ tons. This increase of weight helps the adhesion of the car to the rails, a necessary condition for its propulsion. The old cars can be re-

modelled for about \$250, which shows that the rolling stock of the surface roads can be used at a small cost for alteration. The change that must be made is the raising of the body of the car five inches above its present position to admit of placing the cells under the seats. These batteries have a capacity of 52 horse-power hours, and will run without recharging for 36 miles. The charging of the cells is effected by connecting them with a dynamo at the central station, and allowing the current to pass through them. The solution in the battery is decomposed by the current. When this decomposition is complete the battery is charged. On joining the terminals of the battery with the motor in the car, the separated elements recombine and give back a large percentage of the current spent in separating them. So the whole principle is a change of the kinetic energy of the dynamo current into the potential energy of the disassociated elements in the cells, and the reconversion of this potential energy into the kinetic energy of the electric current, which becomes mechanical energy in the motor. One great difficulty with this battery, in the beginning, was due to the warping of the plates, and a consequent short circuiting. This difficulty is overcome in the new types now in use, and in New York, since September last, there has been no record of short circuiting. If, however, this accident should happen, or should the battery die, the old material can be worked over at a moderate cost. Even should the battery live but six months, it is found to compete favorably with horse-traction.

The success attending the application of electricity in these different ways on our street railroads has led many to speculate on its supplanting our steam locomotives. The work of the Daft motor, Ben Franklin, on the Ninth Avenue elevated road, New York, is very encouraging. This is the largest railway electric motor yet constructed, and it has proved itself capable of doing the work required on these roads. The Ben Franklin weighs ten tons, or is only half as heavy as the steam locomotives in use on the elevated roads. Its total capacity is supposed to be about 150 horse-power. It was built to carry four loaded cars, 75 tons, over any grade of the road. This it has done, exceeding the schedule time by almost three miles per hour. On several occasions it carried eight empty cars, 122 tons, up the heaviest grades at the rate of $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles per hour. Competition is in favor of the electric motor. In the present system there are as many power generators as there are locomotives in use. In the electric system all the power will be taken from one source, a large stationary engine suitably placed somewhere along the line. This means economy. For considering the average locomotive engine, we find a consumption of nine pounds of coal per hour to the horse-power, while a stationary engine yields a horse-power for less than two pounds of coal per hour. This means that the cost of motive power would be reduced more than one-half by the introduction of electric motors. Wear and tear on the road is also diminished, since the weight of the motor is less, while the necessary adhesion is secured by the attraction that exists between the wheels and the rails that carry the

current. A steam locomotive must be always ready to exert its full power, and hence the entire power kept up is the maximum power of each multiplied by the number of engines; but in the electric system, the greatest capacity of the generating station is equal to the average work of one motor multiplied by the number of motors. This depends on an interesting and wonderful principle of self-adjustment possessed by an electric motor.

Dynamos and motors are interchangeable. When we use mechanical power on the machine and generate electric power, we call it a dynamo-electric machine. If we reverse the process and generate mechanical power by putting a current of electricity into the machine, it becomes a motor. While the armature of every motor is revolving and doing mechanical work, the motor retains, to some degree, its character of a dynamo machine. Hence, it is generating a current in opposition to the one that causes it to run. Thus the speed of the motor is regulated from within. If the motor tends to run too rapidly the opposing current is increased and thus the driving current is diminished, if, on the contrary, the motor tends to slow up, the opposing current becomes weak, and the driving current is increased. Considering, then, two electric trains on the same track, the one descending and the other ascending a grade, it is easy to see that the freely revolving motor of the descending train generates a counter-current that lessens the amount of the main current that enters it, and hence leaves the main current stronger to assist the ascending train. Therefore, the average work of one motor multiplied by the number of motors represents the power of the central station, and does away with the present waste of power necessitated by the use of separate locomotive generators. Reduction of attendance is also an item that tends to make the electric motor so much more economical than steam-engines. Cleanliness and absence of noise recommend this system to the public; and from the energy now displayed in this field, and the happy results already obtained, we may look forward to a complete change in our old methods of locomotion.

ALUMINIUM AND THE HEROULT PROCESS.

ALUMINIUM is the third most abundant element in the universe. It is an essential constituent of more than 200 different minerals. Almost all the gem minerals, except diamond, contain it. It occurs in sapphire, ruby, topaz, alexandrite, emerald, garnet, lapis-lazuli, tourmaline, and a host of others. Thus far, however, the compounds worked for the metal are corundum, which is found in great abundance in the western part of North Carolina; cryolite, a double fluoride of aluminium and sodium, which is brought in great quantities to Philadelphia from Arksut Fiord, in Greenland; beauxite, hydrated oxide of aluminium and iron, which occurs in the southern part of France; and common clay, a silicate of aluminium, which is found almost everywhere.

The fine bluish-white color of the metal, its great elasticity and tenacity, its hardness and lightness, combine to make it valuable, and will open for it an extensive market as soon as it be extracted cheaply from its ores. Taking the average price of aluminium at the present time as twelve dollars a pound, the metal contained in a cubic yard of common clay would be worth over eleven thousand dollars. Should aluminium be put in the market at five dollars a pound, as is promised by the Birmingham Co., England, where the Castner process is employed, the value of the metal contained in a cubic yard of clay would still be over four thousand six hundred dollars. The abundance of such a valuable metal has stimulated inventors to work at methods of extracting it, so as to make it a commercial article. Descriptions have been given in past numbers of the CHRONICLE of the Cowles and Castner processes; we will but briefly allude to the new method of M. Heroult. It is in operation at the Swiss Metallurgical Works, Neuhausen, near the Rhine Falls. The process is an electrical one, but differs from the Cowles. In the latter, the electric current is used to produce an exceedingly high temperature, and the reduction of the ore is due to the heat, and therefore any current, whether direct or alternating, may be employed. In the Heroult process, on the other hand, the reduction of the ore is due partly to the heat and partly to the electrolytic action of the current; and hence, only a direct current can be used. The furnace in which the ore is reduced is made of carbon slabs held together by a wrought-iron casing. Through the cover of this furnace a bundle of carbon slabs passes to the interior. The ore is fed in through an opening in the cover which can be closed by a shutter. One of the electric wires is connected with the casing of the furnace and the other with the bunch of carbon slabs that passes through the cover. The current then passes from the carbon slabs through the ore to the molten ore which settles in the bottom of the furnace, and then out through the crucible and the other wire. The molten ore is decomposed, oxygen travelling upward and attacking the carbon, while the reduced metal travels downward and collects in the bottom of the crucible to be drawn off through a tap-hole and cast into ingots. So in this process the molten mass of oxide takes the place of the electrolyte in an ordinary voltaic couple. The ore employed is alumina free from all impurities. The furnace now in operation yields four hundred weight of aluminium in 24 hours. Alloys can also be made by introducing scrap metal into the furnace. When silicon-bronze is desired, scrap copper mixed with clean white sand is introduced into the furnace with the alumina.

BELLITE.

Engineering for February 8th contains a description of a series of experiments made at Chadwell Heath, England, with the new explosive, bellite. This explosive is the invention of Mr. Carl Lamb, and its

properties had already been shown by the Middlesbrough experiments. The experiments were arranged to bring out its characteristic properties and its adaptability to special purposes. One and a half pounds enclosed in a tin box and fired under water by means of a detonator sent the spray one hundred and fifty feet up into the air, thus showing its efficiency in submarine mining. Bellite can be handled with perfect safety and carried any distance without special precautions, as it can be fired only by a detonator. This was shown by breaking a bellite cartridge weighing four ounces in two, and throwing one-half into a fire, where it slowly burnt away. The other half was then exploded on a metal plate 12 inches square and $\frac{3}{8}$ ths of an inch thick. The shock bulged the plate to a depth of about two inches, but did not pierce it. To further convince the examiners of its perfect safety, one of the exhibitors held a portion of a naked bellite cartridge in one hand and applied a lighted fuse to it with the other. As long as the light was applied, it charred and smouldered, but was immediately extinguished on removing the fuse. Another experiment that further established its safety as well as its fitness for use in shells was made. A fragment of explosive was fired from a large-calibre gun against an iron plate without any explosion of the bellite occurring either in the gun or on striking the target. A good idea of its effectiveness was obtained on exploding a mine containing 8 pounds of bellite. The mine was fired under a length of railway laid for this purpose. The explosion broke both rails clean through. Several of the sleepers were splintered, while a large piece of one was thrown a distance of forty yards, and a hole formed in the ground about 12 feet in diameter. On a previous occasion a weight of half a ton was allowed to fall from a height of twenty feet upon some bellite cartridges, grinding them to powder but producing no explosion. The English government was deliberating on spending a large sum of money to acquire the secret of melinite, but will in all probability secure this explosive, which is so safely handled and so effective when discharged by a detonator.

Book Notices.

NARRATIVE AND CRITICAL HISTORY OF AMERICA. Edited by *Justin Winsor*, Librarian of Harvard University, Corresponding Secretary of Massachusetts Historical Society. Volumes V., VI., VII. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

The volumes now before us, together with II., III. and IV., which we noticed in a previous number of the REVIEW, make up the whole work, according to the plan described in its prospectus, excepting the eighth volume, which is still to be published, and the first, which, dealing as it will with the antiquarian history of America, will be the last of the series to be published, in order that advantage may be taken of the farther advancement of American archæological investigations which are now in progress.

In our previous notice we criticised the fundamental idea of the plan of the work, viz., that by associating together a number of writers, each laboring in a distinct field, they would correct each other's partisan, theological, or individual bias, and that this, along with careful revision by the editors, the critical analysis and essay appended to the work of each narrator, would secure to the whole work freedom from the individual dogmatism which detracts from the accuracy and reliability of historical works composed by one person. From the dissenting opinion we then expressed respecting this idea, we find no reason to depart on examining the volumes before us.

But, apart from this, these volumes are full of valuable information, carefully and laboriously collected and arranged, which it would be almost impossible for any one individual to gather respecting the history, social, political, intellectual, industrial and commercial condition and progress of the United States and of Canada, and their relations to the Indian tribes and to European nations during the whole of the last and the first half of the present century. It is thus a historical library in compact form, which, for number and variety of topics treated, is unequalled, or even approximated, by any publication on the general subject of American history, either on our own continent or that of Europe. And though this constitutes its greatest value to the general reader, yet to the scholar and the patient, conscientious investigator of the original sources of history it is its least. To him it will have a value far beyond this. To him it will be of inestimable value as a clue and a guide in directing him to long-forgotten or long-buried and recently-exhumed, but still almost unknown, documents, letters, narratives and other historical monuments or sources of information. To those, too, who delight in having reproduced before their eyes features of renowned explorers, adventurers, leaders, soldiers, statesmen, writers, speakers, or to ponder over the fac-similes of ancient documents, autographs, maps, plans and pictures of ancient buildings, cities, monuments, etc., the work will be a constant subject of pleasant study and enjoyment.

With these general remarks, we pass on to sketch the scope of the volumes before us.

Volume V. consists of eight narrative chapters, each followed by a

critical essay and numerous editorial notes upon the sources of information, etc. The first chapter treats of Canada and Louisiana from the close of the seventeenth century down to 1763. The second chapter has for its subject New England, from 1689 to 1763. The third chapter treats of the "Middle Colonies" during the same period. The fourth, of Maryland and Virginia. The fifth, the Carolinas. The sixth, the English colonization of Georgia. The seventh, the wars on the seaboard; Acadia and Cape Breton. The eighth, the struggle for the great valleys of North America.

Volume VI. is occupied with the history of the revolting colonies from the close of the French and Indian war in 1763 to the Treaty of Peace with England in 1783. It consists of nine chapters, each followed by a critical essay and copious editorial notes. These chapters are respectively entitled: The Revolution Impending; The Conflict Precipitated; The Sentiment of Independence, its Growth and Consummation; The Struggle for the Hudson; The Struggle for the Delaware; The War in the Southern Department; The Naval History of the American Revolution; The Indians and the Border Warfare of the Revolution; The West from the Treaty of Peace with France in 1763 to the Treaty of Peace with England in 1783.

Volume VII. consists of eight chapters, each followed, as in the previous volumes, with a critical essay and editorial notes. The respective titles of these chapters are: The United States of America, 1775-1782; Their Political Struggles and Relations with Europe; The Peace Negotiations of 1782-1783; The Confederation, 1781-1783; The Constitution of the United States and its History; The History of Political Parties; The Wars of the United States; The Diplomacy of the United States.

Following these chapters are two appendices respectively treating on the Territorial Acquisitions and Divisions; and on The Portraits of Washington.

When we come to examine more closely into the manner of treatment of the different subjects discussed, we find very many points which are open to unfavorable, but just, criticism. They are so numerous that even to mention them all would extend this notice beyond reasonable limits. There is one feature, however, which unfortunately characterizes the whole work. It is the undue importance and prominence which have been given to New England, or rather to Puritan ideas and movements, as though they were the chief formative factors of our political institutions and the principles which they embody. The truth is that the leading ideas of Puritanism and Separatism are opposed to the principles of equal political rights and of religious freedom. The examples of the Baptists of Rhode Island, of the Friends of Pennsylvania, and of the Catholics of Maryland were the most potent factors in disseminating and developing these principles in the Thirteen Colonies. And if the people of New England came in the course of time to adopt the same principles, it was not because of their religious tenets, but despite them. The ideal government of the New England Puritans was that of a religious oligarchy, the state and the Puritan churches were virtually identical, and all political power was exclusively in, and wielded entirely by, the members of the churches. That these ideas were gradually broken down in New England despite the persistent opposition of the ministers and members of the Puritan churches, was owing to the growth of industrial and commercial activity, which compelled the Puritans reluctantly to extend political rights to those who were not members of their churches. The whole history of Puritanism in New England conclusively proves this.

The subject of the relation of the New England colonies and of that of New York to the colonists of Canada and the Indians is treated in a very narrow and partial way. The French inhabitants of Canada and the Indian tribes that were controlled by them are represented as the aggressors in the almost continual conflicts between them and the colonists of New England and New York, and the Catholic missionaries who labored with heroic self-denial and disregard of indescribable hardships, tortures and death to Christianize the Indians are represented as secret political agents of the French governors of Canada, and as conspirators against the peaceful growth of the New England colonies and of New York.

Yet, just the opposite of this is true. The strife, so far as the French Canadians were concerned, was for existence and for the right to control, trade in, and colonize the regions which their own explorers had discovered and partly taken possession of. The impelling motive of the New England and New York colonists was that of commercial jealousy and rivalry, and of national and of religious hatred. How preposterous the notion is that the French were the aggressors and needlessly provoked hostilities, either with the Indians or the English colonies, is shown by statements of the condition of Canada at the close of the 17th century, contained in the narrative history of Canada and Louisiana in the 5th volume of the work before us. Referring to the death of Frontenac in 1698 and what he accomplished, the writer says: "A French population of less than 12,000 had been called to defend a frontier of hundreds of miles against the attacks of a jealous and warlike confederacy of Indians, who, in addition to their own sagacious views of maintaining these wars, were inspired thereto by [England] the great rival of France behind them." At that very time, too, when Canada had a European population of barely 12,000, Massachusetts alone had a European population of at least from 60,000 to 80,000. In 1714, according to the writer, "the total population of Canada was not far from 18,000," while "the English colonies counted over 400,000 inhabitants." The disproportion, too, as regards wealth, commercial prosperity, and military resources was still greater. Yet this same writer talks of "the cruel policy" of the French Canadian government "in maintaining an alliance" with the feeble Abnakis, who were partly Christianized and desired nothing of the New England colonists but to possess their own lands in peace. Equally preposterous is the statement that the Canadian government endeavored to "secure quiet in Canada by encouraging raids upon the defenceless towns of New England." The Indian raids upon the New England towns were caused by the cruel treatment of the Indians by the New England Puritans. The incursions from Canada into Northern New York were efforts of the Canadians and their partly Christianized Huron allies to free themselves from the incessant brutal invasions of the savage Iroquois, incited and assisted by the colonists of New York. The French desired peace, and constantly endeavored to establish peaceful relations with the Iroquois and all the other Indian tribes. The English colonists encouraged the Indians to reject the French proposals and to continue their savage warfare.

The same spirit of hostility to Canada, based not only on grounds of commercial rivalry and national jealousy, but also on those of intense religious hatred and bigotry on the part of the English colonies, especially those of New England and New York, continued down to the commencement of the War for Independence. And it was this, especially the element of religious hatred which entered into it, that caused the people of

Canada to reject the request made of them by the American colonies to take up arms with them against Great Britain. Had it not been for this the present Dominion of Canada, with all its vast undeveloped regions, almost equal in aggregate to those of the United States, would have been component parts of the American Union.

To the same narrow and un-Christian method of dealing with the Indian tribes is to be attributed the fact that during the War for Independence the Indians, instead of aiding the colonists, took sides with Great Britain, and not only during that war, but for many years afterwards harassed and raided the frontier settlements of the several States. They simply practised upon us the lesson which we had heinously taught and encouraged them to practise upon the Canadians.

But these unquestionable facts are kept in the background throughout the volumes before us.

A like narrow and partial manner of treatment is traceable in the references to Catholics and the part they took in the War for Independence. They were very few in number compared with the whole population of the Thirteen Colonies. They were objects of hatred and suspicion, and were subjected to grievous political and other disabilities. Yet they were conspicuous for the staunch and unwavering support they gave to the cause of the colonies, and their services were of inestimable value. But the references to these facts by the writers of the work before us are few in number and of the most meagre and indefinite character.

The chapter on the Constitution of the United States, and the different views that were entertained as to the subjects and powers it should include, and on the history of its adoption by the several States of the Union, is especially interesting at this time, when we are on the eve of celebrating the centenary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States, on which event our Federal Constitution may be regarded as having first gone into practical operation. Of like especial interest are other chapters, such as those on the History of Political Parties, the Diplomacy of the United States, and on other kindred subjects.

MANUALS OF CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY (Stonyhurst Series): 1. *Logic*. By *Rev. Richard F. Clarke, S. J.* 2. *The First Principles of Knowledge*. By *Rev. John Rickaby, S. J.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

These are two of a series of six manuals in which the Jesuit Fathers of Stonyhurst College, England, have undertaken to give to modern students an adaptation of Scholastic Philosophy. Hitherto we have had only Latin text-books of more or less lucidity—or want of it—and translations of some of these, made for the most part by Protestants and for use in Protestant institutions. In general, Catholics, therefore, have been without books available for ordinary lay readers, except such as, being written by non-Catholics and too often in a spirit of hostility to our religion, are unsafe for all but adepts in the science. And as even in such of these translations as are available there is too close an adherence to the original in phraseology as well as in matter, they have become antiquated and unsuitable, in view of the developments in our time, not so much of the science of logic itself, but of the branches of learning that are most cognate to it. To overcome this difficulty has been one of the chief objects of the authors and editors of these *Manuals of Catholic Philosophy*; and the end in view has been admirably attained, for not only is the treatment thorough, or at least as much so as the compass of each volume would permit, and the language as near that of everyday life as the nature of the subject would allow, but application is made of the whole subject and of each part of it to the needs of the day. This is

not only Catholic philosophy in the abstract, but applied Catholic philosophy as well.

Though the first in the order of study, the text-book of "Logic" has not been the first to appear in the order of time. After mastering its contents the student should take up the "Text-Book of First Principles." After these two are to come treatises on "Ethics," "Natural Theology," "Psychology," and lastly "General Metaphysics." With these manuals available no one need hereafter complain of lack of weapons with which to oppose the false principles of Hamilton, Mansel, Mill, the Kantists and the Hegelians. The sound principles of Aristotle and St. Thomas are now placed at the disposal of every reader, and it will be the student's own fault if hereafter he fails to find his way "into the safe paths of ancient wisdom, to point out where it is that the speculations of modern philosophizers have quitted the well-trodden high road of truth, and to at least indicate the precipices of inconsistency and self-contradiction to which they conduct the unhappy learner who allows himself to be guided by them." Actuated by the conviction flowing from such considerations as the above, that "a thorough grounding in logic is a most important element" in the intellectual cultivation of the more advanced students in Catholic colleges, and feeling the need for this purpose "of a Catholic text-book of Logic in English, corresponding to those which are in general use in Protestant schools and universities," whose inadequacy has been already pointed out, Father Clarke resolved to compile his treatise on Logic, and his colleagues have been impelled by the same motive to write their various companion treatises. It can now no longer be said that there are no text-books on these subjects either for use in class, where Latin is not the language, or for private study. These latest additions to our literature have, therefore, a wider scope of usefulness than even the best of the Latin treatises which form the basis of the lectures attended by young ecclesiastics; for besides the difficulties of the language, others almost as troublesome are obviated, such as a strange phraseology, technicalities of style, and "complete severance from modern habits of thought and speech," which "render them unintelligible to ordinary students without an elaborate explanation on the part of the teacher," who "has to cover the dry bones with flesh, to enlarge, illustrate, translate, and simplify, and often entirely reconstruct, before he can reach the average intelligence or rouse any interest in his pupils." The English text-books in general use until now, even when orthodox, are not up to the requirements of the time. For the most part literal translations from the Latin, they present the same technical objections as their prototypes, for their editors "have not attempted the further task of translating scholastic into nineteenth century phraseology." It was requisite that our Catholic youth should have a most important branch of study presented to them in a more simple and attractive form. And in doing this Father Clarke and his colleagues have not altogether discarded scholastic terms, but have carefully explained them, and have rendered them into words that convey their meaning to men of average education. In the general plan the scholastic system has been closely adhered to throughout, but it has been clothed in a modern dress. The merest tyro in philosophy may enter at once upon the study of this "Logic," and find it easy and interesting. And by others also are these manuals available. They may prove useful to Protestant students, "perplexed and bewildered by the rival claims of half a dozen different systems, each at variance with the rest, and often also at variance with itself as well," who are "inclined to give up the search for truth in despair and to fall back on the Hamiltonian doctrine of the Relativity of Knowledge, or,

in other words, on the non-existence of truth at all"; for converts to the Catholic Church, who "have unconsciously drunk in a number of principles, some true, some false, from their earliest years, and are often not a little puzzled to discern the true from the false"; and last of all, "to the better educated among young ladies, for," says Father Clarke, "we must remember that in these days the old ideas respecting the limits of feminine education have been not a little modified." He also reminds his readers that in this regard "the change which is being introduced is in many respects only a reassertion of what was common enough in Catholic times. It is an undoubted gain to the cause of truth that women of cultivated tastes should be trained to think correctly, and should have such a knowledge of the principles of logic as may help them thereto. In convent schools and other Catholic institutions the higher education is steadily making way, especially in the United States, and the study of logic is an important element in it."

"The ultimate end aimed at in 'the study of logic' being to train the human mind in exactness of thought," it is time to give an idea of the contents of these two volumes on the subject,—for the second is a work on logic, too, it being a treatise on applied or material logic, as the first-named is on formal, or the elementary principles of, logic. Father Clarke opens with a statement of the province of logic, defines it and states its foundations. Then he deals at length with simple apprehension or conception, with judgment or assent, and lastly with the principles of reasoning or argument. In an appendix is given an account of the Scholastic system of philosophy, on which these manuals are based. To Father Rickaby has been assigned the exposition of a part of applied logic, and his work is separated into two grand divisions, the first being a treatment of the nature of certitude in general, and the second, the special treatment of certitude, under which head come up for consideration the trustworthiness of the sense, and the strength of belief based on human testimony.

If the subsequent volumes of this series keep close to the standard of the two before us, the orthodox English reading public will have within their reach most valuable and effective weapons with which to oppose the sophistries of unbelief.

FREDERICK: CROWN PRINCE AND EMPEROR. A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH DEDICATED TO HIS MEMORY. By *Rennell Rodd*. With an Introduction by Her Majesty, the Empress Frederick. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1888. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

This is a charming book. It is an account of the private life and personal character of the late Emperor Frederick, rather than of his official career. It describes his boyhood and youth, the manner in which his education was conducted, his wooing of Victoria—now the Empress Frederick—in the days of her early girlhood, his marriage to her three years afterwards, his subsequent life while his father (who afterwards became successively King William I., of Prussia, and then William I., German Emperor) was only prince of Prussia.

In subsequent chapters the services rendered by Frederick as a military leader in the war with Austria, and afterwards with France, are briefly but lucidly sketched. But even in this part of his work the object of the writer, evidently, is rather to bring to view the personal character of Frederick than his ability as a general. His humanity, his moderation, his compassion for the suffering, his magnanimity and consideration for the vanquished, his desire to shield as far as possible the peaceful non-combatants of France from the misery incident to the

movements of hostile armies, are all brought prominently forward. So, too, during the interval after the treaty of peace between France and Germany and the death of Emperor William I., the writer chiefly dwells upon Frederick's home life, his interest in the education of his children, his avoidance of intermeddling with political affairs, his visits to England, his warm and intelligent interest in agricultural and other industrial pursuits, his unaffected sympathy with people in the humbler walks of life.

During the latter years of the aged Emperor William's life the Crown Prince Frederick had necessarily to act on different occasions as his father's representative and to speak in his name. But in sketching Frederick's life during this period, his biographer carefully avoids everything of a controversial political character, as he does also in his account of the few short months of the Emperor Frederick's reign. He strives rather to bring to view the nobility of Frederick's character, his high sense of personal responsibility, his tenderness of heart, his patience, and courageous endurance of suffering.

A quotation from his Proclamation to the People of Germany when he succeeded to the throne, and several quotations from his "Rescript" to the Imperial Chancellor, Bismarck, furnish, we believe, important and significant clues to the policy he would have pursued had it pleased God to spare his life.

In the first-mentioned document he says:

"Deeply conscious of the greatness of my task, my sole endeavor will be to . . . make Germany a stronghold of peace, and in harmony with the federal governments, as well as with the constitutional bodies of the Empire and of Prussia, to further the prosperity of my people."

We are well aware that ambitious rulers often veil their intentions with deceptive professions. But Frederick was not insincere and deceitful. There is every reason to believe that he intended to be a constitutional and not an autocratic ruler, and had no desire to enlarge his kingly or imperial power at the expense of the rights of his people. Nor had he any ambition to gratify by needless war. His personal prowess and skill as a military leader had been fully tested and proved. His personal knowledge, too, of the horrors of war caused him to detest it.

Equally significant is the following from his Rescript to Bismarck:

"I am resolved to govern in the Empire and in Prussia with a conscientious observation of the provisions of their respective constitutions."

Of like significance, with regard to the religious question, is the following from the Rescript to Bismarck:

"It is my will that the principle of religious toleration . . . shall continue to extend its protection to all my subjects, to whatsoever religious community and creed they may belong. Every one of them stands equally near my heart, for all of them equally, in the hour of danger, proved their complete devotion."

In the same document the Emperor Frederick thus expresses his ideas of education:

"While, on the one hand, a higher cultivation must be extended to ever-widening circles, we have at the same time to beware of the dangers of half education, of awakening demands which the nation's economic development is unable to satisfy, of neglecting the real business of education in a one-sided effort after increase of knowledge.

"Only a generation growing up on the sound principle of the fear of God, and in simplicity of morals, will possess sufficient power of resistance to counteract the dangers which the whole community incurs in a time of rapid economic development, through the highly luxurious life of individuals."

Preceding the biographical sketch of Frederick is an admirable introduction, in the form of a letter from Victoria (the Empress Frederick) to Mr. Rodd, the biographer. It is truly admirable, both in thought and expression, and elevates the empress in our estimation, as a true, noble woman and wife, far above the opinions we previously have had of her. We cannot omit the following quotation :

" . . . I feel sure that the life of a good and noble man must be interesting to all, and that an example so bright and pure can only do good.

" Those in humbler walks of life who are denied many of the blessings enjoyed by the rich, to whose lot fall the so-called good things of this world, are often apt to imagine that their burden is the hardest to bear, that struggles, and pain, and tears are only for them. These, perhaps, will think differently when they read of sufferings borne with such patience, and of duty cheerfully performed while sickness was undermining the strength of the strong man. . . . "

ANCIENT ROME IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT DISCOVERIES. By *Rodolfo Lanciani*, LL.D. (Harv.), F.R.S., Professor in the University of Greene, etc. With One Hundred Illustrations. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

This superb work is a study of ancient pagan Rome by one who has devoted himself for many years to the work of investigating its remains, and who has had exceptional advantages for prosecuting the work. The scientific archæologist, the investigator of the sources of history and the beginnings of civilization, and the amateur of ancient art, will alike find pleasure and profit in perusing its pages and examining its fac-similes and pictures of ancient remains. By the graphic descriptions of the author, aided by numerous admirable illustrations, the temples and palaces, theatres, forums, its baths, aqueducts, sewers, statues and sculptures, and other works of art, its public squares and suburban villas are brought before our eyes, and its long buried people are made to live over again. The scope of the work and the extensive field it covers may best be understood by a summary statement of its contents. After a lengthy preface, which contains much interesting information respecting successive destructions to which the edifices and ancient remains of Rome were subjected, the first chapter treats of "The Renaissance of Roman Archæological Studies." The second chapter treats of the "Prehistoric Life of Rome," on which, as the author clearly shows, much light has been thrown by recent discoveries of remains whose antiquity reaches far back of the founding of Rome, and dispel many of the doubts that have been raised respecting the truth of the traditions about its founding, and of Romulus as a real person and its actual founder. He traces the origin of its name and of the name of its founder. He shows what were the political and ethnographical condition and divisions of the world when Rome was founded, and that the inhabitants of Italy, Etruria excepted, "had only attained that degree of civilization which is called the civilization of bronze." In the writer's opinion, the origin of Rome must be attributed, plainly not to any deep political thought or inspiration, but to the necessity which compelled Alban shepherds to look for surer and better pasture grounds ; and "that if we cannot admire the pretended political forethought and wisdom of the founders of Rome, we are compelled, at any rate, to admire their manly vigor, their indefatigable energy, which led them in a short time to exchange their pastoral rod for the sceptre of kings, and which turned them, to use the expression of Homer, "from leaders of flocks into leaders of men."

The third chapter treats of the "Sanitary Condition of Ancient Rome." This subject, as the author well says, "is full of practical interest on account of the mighty struggle into which modern Romans have entered against malaria; a plague which seems to be spreading slowly but surely." He is of the opinion that in prehistoric times all the lowlands surrounding the Alban volcanoes, including the Latin districts, were comparatively healthy, owing to the purifying action of telluric fires, of sulphuric emanations and of many kinds of healing springs. He adduces numerous proofs of this. He shows that the now pestilential Campagna must have been thus purified, and declares that this is the only way to explain the presence of a thriving, healthy, strong and very large population in places which, at the end of traditional and the beginning of historic times, are described as pestilential. As for Rome itself, he finds it impossible to credit the truth of Cicero's and Livy's description of it as "salubrious in the midst of a pestilential region." The Palatine and other hills of Rome must, in his opinion, have suffered from the effluvia of the swamps surrounding them, and the boggy quagmires in the valleys which separated them. He finds clear proof of this in the numerous altars and shrines dedicated by the early inhabitants of Rome to the Goddess of Fever and other kindred deities; and after the fall of the Empire, the inhabitants of Rome, raising their eyes to God for help, built a chapel near the Vatican in honor of the Madonna della Febbre—Our Lady of the Fever.

The chief works of sanitary improvement which were constructed in ancient times the author describes in chronological order under the several titles of—I. The Construction of Drains; II. The Construction of Aqueducts; III. The Multiplication and Paving of Roads; IV. The Proper Organization of Public Cemeteries; V. The Drainage and Cultivation of the Campagna; VI. The Organization of Medical Help. In this chapter the civil engineer, the student of sanitary improvements, and the antiquarian, alike, will find much to interest and profit.

We would gladly linger over each of the succeeding chapters of the work, but regard for the limits of space forbids it. Suffice it to say they are replete with rare and valuable information on subjects of great interest, as may be inferred from their respective titles, which are as follows: Public Places of Resort; The Palace of the Cæsars; The House of the Vestals; The Public Libraries of Ancient and Mediæval Rome; The Police and Fire Department of Ancient Rome; The Tiber and the Claudian Harbor; The Campagna; The Disappearance of Works of Art, and their Discovery in Recent Years.

We cannot conclude without remarking that the investigations that have been prosecuted by the present government of Rome, and the other works it has carried forward, involve a loss and a ruthless destruction of monuments of Christian antiquity, which must sadden the heart of every one who at all appreciates what Christianity and Christians have done for mankind. On the lamentable change which has thus been made in Rome, we quote briefly from the author's preface. He says:

" It is useless to deny that the picturesqueness and the main characteristics of the Rome of the Popes are now a matter of the past." Then, speaking of the churches and monasteries, etc., that remain, he says: "We miss their old surroundings. . . . It is impossible to imagine anything more commonplace, and out of keeping, and shabby, and tasteless, than the new quarters which encircle the city of 1870."

The author looks upon this from the point of view of an artist, but still more sorrowful is it when contemplated from a Christian position.

THE WANDERING KNIGHT; HIS ADVENTUROUS JOURNEY; OR, A MÆDIEVAL PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. By *Jean de Cartheny*, Brother in the Religious Order of Mount Carmel, and Canon Theologian of the Diocese of Cambrai. Newly translated into English, under Ecclesiastical Supervision, from the edition of 1572. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

The allegorical romance, of which the book before us is a translation, is believed by many to have suggested and furnished John Bunyan with materials for his famous work, "The Pilgrim's Progress." Comparing the two, a critic of some reputation recently gave the palm of excellence to "The Pilgrim's Progress," because, in his opinion, it was more imaginative and entertaining, and fuller of striking incidents. These characteristics may all be conceded to John Bunyan's book without at all detracting from the solid merits of the work before us or implying that Bunyan's is really the better book. It can be conceded for the same reason that to very many persons the vivid descriptions of Jules Verne's scenes and incidents during an imaginary voyage under the ocean are more entertaining than the true account of any real voyage. Bunyan's fancy had no law to restrain it, and to him truth was whatever he imagined or believed to be true. But the writer of the work before us could exercise his imagination only within the limits of the actual truth as revealed by God and taught by the Holy Catholic Church.

With respect to the real solid value of the two works there is no room for comparison. "The Wandering Knight" is truthful in the lessons it inculcates, for it follows and embodies the teachings of the infallible Church of Christ. The "Pilgrim's Progress" is a mixture of truth and error, for it is a record only of his own ideas and fancies about subjects which the work before us, there is reason to believe, in great part suggested. Yet while thus solid and fruitfully suggestive of meditations upon subjects of deep practical importance to every one who desires and strives to lead a Christian life, "The Wandering Knight" is also highly interesting and entertaining as well as instructive. It is based upon and is an enlargement of our Divine Lord's parable of the Prodigal Son. Its graphic accounts of the adventures of the Wandering Knight are consistent, truthful, and lucid descriptions of the experiences of a young man who starts forth in quest of enjoyment, with no guide but his own inclinations and passions, drains every cup of pleasure that natural desires suggest and folly proffers to him, and then finds only bitter, bitter disappointment and self-contempt and regret as the result. But God has not abandoned him, and Divine grace comes to his help, and accepting and corresponding with that grace, he is lifted out of the quagmire of wretchedness into which he plunged himself, is led along the "Narrow Way," is delivered from the perils that beset him on either side, until he obtains the "Gift of Perseverance," reaches the "Mansion of Virtue," and then journeys along the "Way of Peace." The work is highly entertaining, highly instructive, and is replete with solid, practical, and very suggestive Christian lessons.

THE NEW SUNDAY SCHOOL COMPANION. Containing the Catechism; Devotions and Prayers for Church, Home and School; Hymns and Simple Music for Mass and other Solemnities. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

The title of this little manual indicates its contents. It is an excellent hand-book for adults as well as for children. The Catechism it contains is the Catechism prepared and enjoined by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore; the other instructions and devotions and prayers are those which for long ages have been sanctioned and approved by the Church.

RUDIMENTS OF HEBREW GRAMMAR. Translated from the seventh Latin edition of Vosen-Kaulen's "Rudimenta" by *H. Gabriels*, Rector of St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, N. Y. Freiburg in Breisgau: B. Herder, Publisher. 1888. (St. Louis, Mo., 17 South Broadway.) 16mo. Pp. 129. Price, 65 cents.

Vosen's grammar has long enjoyed general favor in the schools of Catholic Germany. It was first published in German in 1853, and ran through six editions in the course of six or seven years. In 1860, when a new edition was called for, the author determined to make his work more widely useful by rewriting it in Latin. But the substance of his book (*interna libelli ratio*, as he himself says in Praefat. A.D. 1860) remained unchanged, as did its popularity also; for the translation seems to have passed through seven more editions. About five years ago, after Dr. Vosen's death, a new reprint being needed, the Freiburg publisher, B. Herder, requested the aid of Dr. Kaulen, one of the best-known biblical scholars of Catholic Germany; and to him we are indebted for an edition in which judicious correction and retrenchment have been happily used. It is an excellent work, and its increase in general favor is attested by the fact that the Vosen-Kaulen Grammar, as it is called, has been reprinted no less than sixteen times within the last five years; so we are informed by Dr. Krieg's valuable periodical (*Literarische Rundschau*, volume of 1888, p. 319).

Dr. Gabriels, of Troy, has done a good work for our American seminaries (in which the study of Hebrew is now made imperative by laws of the last Plenary Council) by translating the Vosen-Kaulen Grammar of Hebrew. The old rules of Bellarmin, Slaughter and others of the old school are too mechanical for our grown youth, though excellent in themselves and most valuable for children or young boys who are to be introduced to the mysteries of the Holy Tongue. But it must be remembered that our seminarians begin this study when they are in the class of philosophy. There is, therefore, no reason why they should be subjected to the mechanical formalism that was expedient for them when they studied Latin grammar or prosody. There are a few statements which, on account of their generality, may mislead the student. On p. 27 it is said: "In the converted Future, the accent *generally* is thrown back to the preceding syllable, and the vowel of the last syllable, if a closed one, is shortened." He then gives as examples *Yomer* (with *Ssere*) and *Vayyomer* (with *Segol*), *Yamot* (*morietur*) and *Vayyamot* with *o* breve. The assertion is not sufficiently qualified. It should read, not "generally," but "often." And this is the very word (*SAEPE*) used by Dr. Vosen in his translation which we have now before us. ("Rudimenta Linguæ Hebraicæ," Ed. III., emendata. Friburgi Brisigavorum, 1865, § 27, De Van Conversiro, n. 3.) But the blame of such unqualified statements may be laid at the door of many Hebrew grammarians, even Gesenius himself.

The thanks of our professors and students in ecclesiastical seminaries are eminently due to Dr. Gabriels for his translation of this useful little book.

SHORT INSTRUCTIVE SKETCHES FROM THE LIVES OF THE SAINTS FOR THE USE OF PAROCHIAL AND SUNDAY SCHOOLS, ACADEMIES, ETC. New York: J. Schaeffer, Publisher. 1888.

This little volume is published with the *Imprimatur* of the Most Rev. Archbishop of New York. The "sketches" are brief, concise and well written, and the selection of the Saints whose Lives are thus sketched is judicious.

LEAVES FROM ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM. Selected and translated by *Mary H. Allies*. Edited, with a preface, by *T. W. Allies, Ph.G., S.G.* New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

Those who have the "Leaves of St. Augustine" will value this volume not only on account of its intrinsic merits, which are very great, but also as a worthy companion to the first mentioned work. St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom belong to the same age, were two of its most brilliant lights amidst a glorious constellation of Saints and Church Fathers. The scenes of their labors were far apart. They were of different thought and race. The one was an African, the other a Greek; their minds were cast in different moulds, and shaped and trained in different schools, the one in the severe logic of the Romans, the other in the polished rhetoric of Greece. Yet they both looked to St. Paul chiefly as their master and exemplar, and represented in their writings different sides or aspects of the great Apostle to the Gentiles; the one developed his doctrine in the form of systematic theology, the other in the way of homiletical theology.

The work before us well brings out the power and surpassing eloquence of St. Chrysostom. It is chiefly made up of judiciously chosen selections from his homilies and discourses—discourses which are models of Christian eloquence, models which might well be studied to-day, and which though few, perhaps none, could hope to equal, yet which might well be imitated so far as individual ability will permit.

In addition to a preface containing a brief but lucid sketch of St. Chrysostom's life and labors, and a list of his numerous writings—perhaps the most numerous of any Church Father of that age, certainly of the Church Fathers in the East—the work consists of three parts.

The first of these parts consists of selections from homilies on texts chiefly taken from St. Matthew's Gospel, and some also from St. Paul's Epistles. The general scope and character of these may be inferred from the title of this part, which is: "The King's Highway." The second part, entitled: "The King's House," consists of selections from homilies on subjects connected with the foundation and nature of the Church, the Priesthood, and the Sacraments. The third part consists of letters of St. Chrysostom, written on different occasions and to different persons, and which are models of Christian epistolary communications.

SHORT INSTRUCTIONS FOR LOW MASSES; OR THE SACRAMENTS EXPLAINED. By *Rev. James Donahoe*, of St. Thomas Aquinas' Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. Fr. Pustet & Co.; New York and Cincinnati.

Extravagant as we may seem, we could find no words too strong to commend these admirable "instructions." They are brief, concise, yet comprehensive in their scope and full of important information on the subjects they treat of, lucidly and pointedly imparted.

The instructions on the Sacraments are preceded by a discourse admirable for its clearness and simplicity on the nature, the necessity, the source and effects of Divine Grace. Passing over all the chapters occupied with lucid and edifying explanations and instructions respecting the other Sacraments, the fourteen discourses upon the Sacrament of Matrimony we cannot too highly commend. They embrace the whole subject, so far as it is necessary for the laity to be informed upon it. They are prudent, discreet, yet plain and practical. Without being in the slightest degree controversial, they touch upon and expose every false notion and vicious practice connected with the subject on which they treat.

LITURGY FOR THE LAITY; OR, AN EXPLANATION OF SACRED OBJECTS CONNECTED WITH DIVINE WORSHIP. By *James H. O'Donnell*. *Permissu Superiorum*. New York: P. O'Shea, Publisher, 45 Warren Street. 1888.

This little volume has been compiled, as its title indicates, especially for the use of lay Catholics. It is an unpretentious work, but withal a very instructive and valuable one for those for whose use it is intended. It contains clear and concise explanations of the sacred objects connected with Divine worship, which are constantly seen by worshippers in Catholic churches.

There are already many ably written books upon the subjects which this work treats of, but these are intended chiefly for theological students or for priests. Many of them, too, are in Latin, and even those of them that are in the English language are so erudite, and comprise so many topics that are of immediate concern only to clerics, that the average lay reader is not interested in them.

The compiler of this work has evidently labored conscientiously and faithfully to make his book reliable and valuable. His facts and explanations have been gathered from many different sources, and are presented in a style of great simplicity and clearness. As his book is not intended as a text-book, and is entirely free from technicalities, he omits stating in foot-notes the authorities upon which he relies, but has given, immediately before the table of contents, a long list of the different books he has consulted in preparing this volume.

THE HISTORY OF CONFESSION; OR, THE DOGMA OF CONFESSION VINDICATED FROM THE ATTACKS OF HERETICS AND INFIDELS. Translated from the French of *Rev. Ambrose Guillois* by *Louis de Goesbriand, D.D.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

Bishop de Goesbriand is entirely too modest in regard to the part which he has taken in the production of this most useful little work. It is not simply a translation, it is even more than an adaptation, for a goodly part of it is original with the Bishop. He has merely taken Guillois' work as a basis and built thereon what is practically a new superstructure. The form of the French work has been changed, and for the better, too; chapters are substituted for the letters of the original; many things of a merely local or personal character have been retrenched; and the Bishop has added many remarks of his own to the most important chapter of the book, that which treats of the institution of Confession by our Saviour.

The titles of the chapters of this book, "one of the most complete and instructive treatises hitherto written about confession," are: Antiquity of Confession; Confession Found Among the Pagans; Obligation of Confession Established by Jesus Christ; Confession Always Practised in the Church of Christ; Divine Origin of Confession Proved by the Councils of the Church and by Numerous Facts Drawn from the First Ages; Divine Institution of Confession Proved from Reason; Public Confession and Penance as Practised in the Early Ages; Testimonies of Protestantism in Favor of Confession; The Use of Confession; Answer to an Objection; Secret and Seal of Confession.

ST. PATRICK, THE FATHER OF A SACRED NATION. A Lecture. By *Rev. J. F. Loughlin, D.D.* Published for the Church of Our Lady of the Rosary. Philadelphia.

This is an eloquent, lucid and highly edifying exposition of the interior significance of Ireland's history.

RECORDS OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS OF 1715. Compiled wholly from original documents. Edited by *John Orlebar Payne, M.A.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

There has of late been a remarkable awakening of English-speaking Catholics, on both sides of the Atlantic, to the importance of preserving whatever historical documents pertaining to them may still be in existence. In England the work is left entirely to isolated individual efforts, while in America the same method of labor has been supplemented by the organized efforts of societies. The volume before us is a most valuable contribution to English-Catholic history, a worthy continuation of that on the "English Catholic Non-Jurors of 1715," and throws much light upon the sufferings and adventures of English Catholics of that period. The chief sources of the information here given are, in the first place, nearly four hundred wills and letters of administration, and, in the second place, copious extracts from the "Forfeited Estates Papers" kept at the Public Record Office. A copious index of over thirty pages completes the work and illustrates, in a way which nothing else can, the genealogical value of such unpublished and authentic documents as are given in this book.

THE LIFE AND GLORIES OF ST. JOSEPH, HUSBAND OF MARY, FOSTER FATHER OF JESUS, AND PATRON OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH. Grounded on the Dissertations of *Canon Antonio Vitali, Father José Moreno*, and other writers. By *Edward Healy Thompson*. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

Mr. Healy Thompson has long since taken rank among the foremost of biographical writers in the English language, and every succeeding work from his pen may now, almost without examination, be set down as a valuable addition to Catholic literature. After careful inspection of the portly and handsome volume before us, the exacting critic is forced to the same conclusion. Though professing to be "a composite work, constructed with materials gathered from various quarters," yet it presents all the charms of originality; that is, as far as any biography or history can be original, the patchwork being so skilfully arranged as not to mar the unity and continuity of the whole. Everything known of the foster father of the Redeemer is given here. In an appendix to this latest addition to the Library of Religious Biography are given the decree of Pius IX. declaring St. Joseph Patron of the Universal Church, and a Prayer to St. Joseph.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN McMULLEN, D.D., FIRST BISHOP OF DAVENPORT, IOWA. By *Rev. James J. McGovern, D.D.*, with an Introduction by the *Right Reverend John Lancaster Spalding, D.D.*, Bishop of Peoria. Chicago and Milwaukee: Hoffman Brothers. For sale by the author, Box 123, Lockport, Illinois.

Rev. Dr. McGovern has performed a labor of love, a duty which he owed to a noble friend, and has done it well. It is certainly an encouraging sign of the times to see so many works of this character coming from the press, smoothing the path for the future historian of the Church in this country. The only regret we feel is that we have not more works of the kind.

Bishop Spalding's introduction is an able summary of Bishop McMullen's career, combined with a review of the difficulties experienced by a pioneer missionary in this country.

THE LITTLE BOOK OF SUPERIORS. By the author of "Golden Sands." Translated from the ninth French edition by *Miss Ella McMahon*. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

This little volume contains ample and apposite directions for the guidance of those in charge of religious communities. A brief introduction clearly explains the nature of the work proper, which is divided into six chapters, and followed by an appendix of twenty pages. The first chapter treats of the duties to be fulfilled, the second of the virtues to be practised, the third of the faults to be avoided, the fourth of the obstacles to be overcome, the fifth of the means to be employed, and the sixth of the rewards to be hoped for. The appendix contains the rules and duties of a pious superior, and various thoughts and maxims.

CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF ARCHBISHOP ULLATHORNE. With bibliographical introduction arranged by the *Rev. Michael F. Glancey*. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

The writings of Archbishop Ullathorne are known and highly prized by all English-speaking Catholics. They embrace a very great variety of subjects, all of which are treated with eminent ability and clearness. The selecting from them of characteristic passages must necessarily have been a work of great difficulty. But, difficult as it was, it has been done, and exceedingly well done, in the volume before us.

LETTERS TO PERSONS IN RELIGION. By *St. Francis De Sales*. With introduction by *Bishop Hedley*, and fac-simile of the Saint's handwriting. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1888.

This volume is the fourth of the English translation of the works of St. Francis De Sales, which are in process of issue from the press of the above-mentioned publishing houses. It comprises a very complete and carefully arranged selection of the holy Doctor's Letters to Religious persons. They are characterized by the attractiveness, sweetness of spirit and depth which are to be found in all his writings.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE OF THE REV. FRANCIS A. BAKER, Priest of the Congregation of St. Paul. By *Rev. A. F. Hewit*. Seventh Edition. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

That a good biography of a worthy subject will always find favor with those for whom it is intended, is shown by the large number of editions through which this memoir has passed. The style is simple, and the direct narrative tells more effectively in praise of its subject than would a eulogy of twice the length. Father Hewit's beautiful memoir of his fellow-priest should find a place in every Catholic library.

CORRECTIONS.—In the number of this REVIEW for October of last year an error occurred in the make-up of Professor Herbermann's article on "The Myths of the 'Dark' Ages." What was intended to be the closing paragraph was erroneously placed immediately after the introduction. It begins, near the foot of page 589, with the words, "This view," etc., and ends with the quotation at the top of the following page.

The article in the January number of the current year entitled, "The So-called Problem of Evil," attributed to Rev. M. A. Walsh, S.J., should be credited to Rev. M. A. Power, S.J.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—JULY, 1889.—No. 55.

CATHOLICITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS.

WE will not say that it is strange how some men think, speak, and write as they do about the Catholic Church, as if she were an institution founded in usurpation, upheld by despotism, and opposed in principle and in act to human liberty and right, despite her constant denial of the charge and counter-complaint of being herself the persecuted one and the victim of foul play. We have lived long enough to learn that in all family quarrels each side makes the most of its wrongs, real or fancied.

Certainly the Catholic Church is much complained of, but she has her complaint as well, and she makes it. Such of the world who oppose her say to her in no measured tones of indignation: "You fetter our liberties in thought, word, and deed, or where you do not it is the happy result for us of lack of opportunity, not of will. You deny to our fellow-men, who are blind enough to believe in you, their rights as men and women, as citizens and Christians. You stand in the way of progress. You are by nature a spiritual despot, and when you obtain sway are a social and political one, too. We cannot live at peace with you, and we are convinced that it is for the good of mankind to get rid of you as soon as possible."

To half-educated, self-conceited, clap-trap orators and essayists of the Ingersollian type, she is a profound enigma both in existence and doctrine. Unwilling to acknowledge anything to be beyond their ken, either in the heavens above or in the earth be-

neath or in the waters under the earth, and not daring, because consciously unable, to meet her face to face with logical argument, they dismiss both her and her pretensions with a contemptuous wave of the hand, or pile epithet upon epithet to denounce her as a dangerous enemy to mankind, specially to that "enlightened" portion of the race they now have the honor to address. Ill-concealed, uneasy jealousy of her intellectual superiority and open hate of her exalted moral purity, find a very just expression of their convictions in the sentence that "the only reformation of which she is capable is destruction."¹

To all this the Church calmly replies: "You, who thus speak, know neither me nor my children whom I put into possession of superior rights and higher privileges than any you are able to claim or enjoy. You persecute me without cause. You deny me and mine the liberty you claim for yourselves. Your complaints are calumnies; for I am no tyrant, but the very teacher and mistress of liberty. Banish me, achieve your reformation of me by destruction, and progress in what is worthy would be impossible. I am the prophet, priest, and judge of all right, social, political, and religious." Here is, to say the least, a very serious human family misunderstanding. We propose to do a little more than give an "honest opinion" thereon, which would appear to be the highest evolution of human thought possible in the eyes of the Church's adversaries,—we propose to get at the truth.

We begin with the first of all facts, the reason of all things, the source of all right, the last appeal in all dispute, the solution of all questions—God. He who would investigate the nature, life, aspirations, claims, or destiny of man without reference to God, must first prove that without God he is man. If man can lay claim to any prerogative as a right; if any goal of ambition is open to him; if, face to face with his fellow-man, he may exact compliance with his own will, or refuse his obedience to the will of another, such claim is valid, such ambition is lawful, such rights of equality or superiority are just only because they are, at last account, the rights and prerogatives of God Himself in His own creation, to be exercised for His sake, and to be enjoyed by Him in pursuance of the end which can alone justify the existence of man at all. The rights of man are therefore divine in origin, as are also the institutions of the family, society, state, and church through which they are transmitted. As origin of all that is, God is not only first but final cause. This latter attribute is one which the modern self-styled scientist finds it very convenient to ignore; and herein lies the only

¹ *The North American Review*, "Professor Huxley and Agnosticism." By Col. R. G. Ingersoll.

logical consistency of agnosticism. There is cause and effect; but they illogically deny that the *first effect* is correlative to the *first known*, which supposes a First Knower as First Cause. Their conception of cause rises no higher than what philosophers distinguish as impersonal and unknowing secondary causes. Even in intelligent causes the idea of final cause as involving purpose of action finds no exemplar in their so-named absolute cause, which consequently is as unknowing as it is unknowable.

But the common sense of mankind instinctively recognizes the truth of the Catholic philosophy of the creative act. Men acknowledge the Divine original source of their rights, and as well that God is the judge of their just enjoyment—at least when it subserves their own interest, as is shown in the fact that the Divine sanction has been universally invoked upon the ratification of the matrimonial, social, political, and religious compact, and that whenever they are deprived of the free and just exercise of their rights as claimed under any of these institutions, they appeal to God for defence and judgment.

The very idea of right, whether considered as an attribute of man as an intelligent and responsible being, or as affecting his relations with others of his kind, and with the inferior orders of created beings, is a divine idea, whose expression is correlative to and dependent upon the other ideas, equally divine, of authority and obedience for love.

Authority supposes an author, an origin, and man is the absolute author or origin of nothing. Neither could he originate the idea of authority. He must necessarily find it in the Divine manifestation made to his intelligence of the Divine *reason why* he is a creature of the Divine Author, as he must also deduce the ideas of the family, of society, of the state, and of the church, not alone from the simply observed facts of the existence of those institutions, but from the consideration of the divine intention or *reason why* of them. If their final purpose does not originate with man, he cannot claim the originality of having invented them; neither can he arrogate to himself anything more than a secondary instrumentality in their actual institution and perfection.

Lacking the manifestation of these divine ideas, his reason might recognize the facts of priority and power, from which he can deduce indeed the obedience of subjection or slavery, as universally found among nations among whom the memory of the original Divine intention became more or less obliterated, but never the obedience of love and the filial relation of man to God; nor that same relation, fitly characterized as filial, existing between supreme authority and the subject such as we have seen exhibited in former days by society and states, Catholic and Christian, based as they

were upon a full recognition of that manifestation of the Divine Will. In them we behold with admiration what pagan society never dreamed of, and what the revival of paganism in modern society is fast rendering a dream of the past; on the one hand strength and moderation in rule, with valorous loyalty combined with noble self-respecting freedom on the other.

Man may be said to have invented the *Imperium*, and may boast of it so far as it has any value towards the advancement of a true civilization of the race, but never authority. Obligation of service from the inferior in intelligence and strength he could invent, but not obedience from equals, and still less willing obedience to equals or inferiors from those superior to them.

We, who in this day are living under the beneficent influences (or what is left by demagogues or charlatans, social, political, and religious) of a civilization which is divine and not human; breathing the atmosphere of a society whose warmth and fruitfulness is wholly due to and dependent upon the divine spirit infused into the life and conditions of the family, civil society, government, and the Christian Church, are apt to take all this for granted as the result of what is gratuitously assumed to be the natural product of human progress; forgetting the lessons of history, which amply prove the vaunted progress of man, left to his own devices, to have always culminated in forms of civilization which, of themselves, tended to the exaltation of the sensual over the spiritual, to the aggrandizement of the *Imperium* at the expense of human liberty and divine right, to the alternation of a blind, self-destructive anarchy, with the basest and most degrading slavery. All the rights of which we boast, and which we so highly prize, are of divine origin, enjoyed as the fruit of a divine civilization, built incontestably upon the principles of authority and the obedience of love; an authority which was ever accepted as a reflex of the Divine Will, and a cheerful obedience of love, imitating the obedience of the one and only Regenerator, Redeemer, and Civilizer of men; an obedience of love culminating in the sacrifice of the cross, example of the highest wisdom of God, but to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Gentiles foolishness; and, we may add, to the agnostic, superstition.

Whatever may have been the original revelation made to the first parents of the race, it is plain that, so far as history gives evidence, mankind everywhere soon fell into a state which possessed but a very imperfect realization of what we would now deem to be a civilization of humanity worthy of the name. What we do know is, that God, so to speak, has accommodated the actual revelation of His Divine Will to the state to which mankind had either reduced or advanced itself by the unconstrained use of its free will. When we

see certain actual proclamations of the Divine Will made, as, for instance, through Moses and the prophets, and the most clear and perfect revelation of all made by our Lord, they seem to us as if made in advance of their age, or "before their time"; though, as we now see, particularly in the history of Catholicity, which is only a life development of the revelation made by Jesus Christ and its application to human affairs, all these manifestations were made just when God knew that mankind could and would receive them with profit. The development and enforcement of the Christian revelation by Catholicity amongst the nations exhibit precisely the same toleration of the actual state of mankind and recognition of man's free will, meanwhile teaching, inviting, persuading him into the paths of a higher civilization, which the Divine economy has always shown from the beginning of the world.

If man is seen at any time rising out of ignorance and barbarism, or struggling for a higher and purer elevation of his intellectual and moral nature, it is because God by some means is teaching him and revealing either directly or mediately glimpses of the divinely true, good and beautiful sufficiently clear to attract without compelling him, and thus leaving the order of merit intact.

Humanity civilizes itself through Divine instruction and by Divine invitation and help; but that man may justly receive the merit and enjoy its fruits, nothing can be plainer than that he is under the necessity of overcoming the proclivities of his nature, which, of themselves, lead him to the aggrandizement of power, self-indulgence of his baser appetites and consequent descent to a lower order of civilization. And this victory over himself cannot be accomplished without recognition of the Divine Will as the reason why of his submission to the efforts required of him, whether that Divine Will be expressed in the primal prohibition: "Thou shalt not eat of the tree of good and evil," in the ten commandments of Sinai, or in the completer definition of the moral law as made by the Catholic Church.

That which the fallen nature of Adam least of all desires, and against which it wages a perpetual and spiteful war, is precisely the civilization, the honor of whose triumphs philosophers of the rationalist school impudently ascribe to man as its creator, yet whose fundamental principles of life, and the only possible meritorious aid which man can give towards its successful achievement, they ignorantly denounce in the same breath as puerile, womanish, and absurd, the principles of self-denial and sacrifice.

Let them clamor as loudly as they may to the contrary, the civilization of modern society, or at least all of it which has refined and elevated the spiritual in man, is the civilization of the children of God, and not of the children of men; a civilization built upon obedience, self-denial, and the sacrifice of martyrs.

The principles of priority and power can give license to sensuality and refinement to vice, but the resulting civilization, so called, can produce, as history plainly shows, nothing better than the base nobility of wealth or of brute force on the one hand, and servitude, combined with a poverty that is esteemed despicable, on the other.

Until the light and liberty of a Divine civilization burst upon the world, and wherever man, swayed by his prevaricated nature, arrogated to himself the foundation and achievement of his own destiny, and assumed the prerogatives of creator and lord of the family, the state and the church, right and might were synonymous.

If Divine civilization succeeded in supplanting the vain and incompetent attempts of human civilization, it has done so by virtue of precisely the opposite principles assumed by the latter. It has overcome the world by suffering and sacrifice, by proclaiming the inscrutable logic of divine wisdom in the Gospel beatitudes—to human wisdom senseless paradoxes, and bestowing with her hands of benediction the possession of the earth as an inheritance upon the meek, and the kingdom of God upon the poor.

Egyptian, Grecian, and Roman civilizations, the highest and most powerful of all human forms of it, bore indeed within their gigantic frames the seeds of mortal disease, as all things human do since the day in which God declared the surety of death as a penalty for self-deification and self-indulgence; but the secret of their overthrow lay in the divinely irresistible power of the cross of Jesus Christ, who, as God, declared that when He should be uplifted upon it He would draw all things to Himself. Surely if ever human reason had a fair field to exhibit its power to elevate and refine mankind, and lay the foundation of an imperishable empire, one might expect to have seen its accomplishment in the bosom of those three great nations. The cultivation of the beautiful alone, in art, philosophy, and literature, and even in religion (for what could surpass the humanly beautiful in pagan mythology), reaching as it did amongst them an eminence of perfection never equalled, might appear to have justly warranted the hope of perpetual sovereignty in the intellectual, political, and religious world, and of itself to have been a sufficiently firm basis to ensure permanence of the order of civilization of which it was the fruit. So it might have been but for one thing—it manifested only a *human* reason why, the deification of human passion and pride; but we look in vain for any expression of the divine reason why.

The decadence and downfall of those nations is an enigma to all who cannot or will not see in it the finger of the hand of God, whose *Mane, Thekel, Phares* we to-day can read inscribed upon the

Egyptian obelisk standing before the portals of the temple of the divine reason why, rearing its majestic presence above the ruins of the city of imperial Rome, standing amid thousands of her broken triumphal arches and sculptured pillars lying prostrate before its walls, though far more perfect in their forms of beauty than its own—

Ecce Crucem Domini, fugite partes adversæ !

“Behold the cross of the Lord! Let all its adversaries be put to flight!”

Yet, again and again it must renew its victory as age succeeds age, and the proud heart of man rises in rebellion against the authority of God. Self-conceited philosophers and self-constituted leaders delude the people with cries of liberty and human rights; and having aroused the passions and greed of the multitude, and succeeded in disturbing the reigning order so laboriously established by self-sacrifice in the defense of truth, announce disorder, and call upon mankind to right the wrongs they themselves have created. Thence are inaugurated those bloody and nation-destroying revolutions, prepared by the denial of the Divine Authority in church and state, and the undermining of the very foundation stone of the social order—the institution of the family—by divorce and free love; and wrecking the political fabric by the propagation among the masses of anarchical principles, now called liberalism, now socialism, now communism, and already nihilism, the most impudent defiance of the Divine Authority ever dared since Lucifer uttered his “Non serviam!” against the Most High God.

In every instance their work has been, as it plainly must be, a work of destruction; and the foolish and guilty nations, appalled at the scene of carnage and ruin that has ever followed in the train of these apostles of error; reading the pages of the history of their own folly and misfortunes, blotted with tears and stained with blood; and feeling the tightening of the shackles of slavery which the triumph of error has imposed upon them, see too late the borders of the yawning abyss to which Satan, disguised as an angel of regeneration, has, with artful wiles, seduced them.

Loud and deep are now the curses heaped upon the heads of the would-be regenerators of the disturbed social order by the unhappy and disappointed people; and dreadful has been the vengeance wreaked upon them by their betrayed dupes. Furious and insensate is the wrath of these Satanic emissaries who perceive themselves baffled of their expected and, as they hoped, assured triumph over God. Our pen almost refuses to repeat the horrible blasphemies which they dare to pour forth from their raging lips. But let us listen to one; for as the traveller who, in the darkness of night, hears not far off the roar and crashing din of some hidden cataract

of angry waters as it plunges down through jagged rocks from a precipitous height to a swirling whirlpool in the abyss beneath, suddenly arrests his footsteps and dares no nearer approach lest he be instantly engulfed and hurled to certain death, so the perusal of the words of one who spoke as only man could speak under the dominion of a spiteful, disappointed demon, may cause many to stop and think whither men of a like spirit, albeit feebler imitators, are, in our own day, haling them on, under pretense of reforming and regenerating the social condition of the suffering masses.

Thus Proudhon: "Why adore this phantom of a Deity? And what does he require of us by that band of enthusiasts who, on all sides, persecute us with their sermons? God! I do not acknowledge any God. God is, moreover, nothing but pure mysticism. If you wish us to listen to you, commence by banishing this word from your discourse; because the experience of three thousand years teaches me that he who speaks to me of God would rob me of my liberty or my purse. How much do you owe me? How much do I owe you? This is my religion and my God. This I say: The first duty of an intelligent and free man is immediately to discard the idea of God both from his soul and his conscience; because God, if he exists, is essentially hostile to our nature, and we are in nothing dependent upon him. By what right could God say to me, 'Be thou holy even as I am holy'? Lying spirit! I would say to him in reply, 'thou imbecile God, thy sovereignty is already at an end, seek other victims among the brutes; I know that I am not, neither can I ever become, holy, and how canst thou be so if thou and I resemble each other? Eternal father, Jupiter or Jehovah, whatever thou wishest to be called, learn from me that men know thee. Thou art, thou wast, and thou wilt ever be the rival of Adam, the tyrant of Prometheus. The times are now changed, and we behold thee weakened and dethroned. So long as humanity lies prostrate before an altar, the slave of kings and priests, it will continue condemned. Withdraw from me, thou Jehovah, for henceforth, freed from fear of thee, and having attained true wisdom, I swear with uplifted hand to heaven that thou art only the tormentor of my reason and the spectre of my conscience!'"¹

Who does not hear with shudderings of soul in this language of hell the echo of the cry of the demons of the sepulchres cast out aforetime by the Saviour of men when they said to him: "What have we to do with Thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? Art Thou come hither to torment us before the time?"

¹ Proudhon, *System of Contradictions*, chap. viii.

What other explanation can be given of the rancorous attacks made upon the Catholic Church by those "friends of humanity" who set up the standard of liberty, equality and fraternity, and even prate of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man: terms which have ever been not only the watchwords of Catholicity, but with which she for centuries led the people on to a divine victory over tyrants and themselves; rescuing them from the slavery of barbarism and the enervating thralldom of a pagan civilization. The socialism of to-day, with all its guile, cannot hide its vindictive hatred of the Church; for it instinctively knows, like the demons of old, that the Son of God is passing by its editorial and forensic sepulchres in the person of that divine Church, His other self.

We cannot refrain from pursuing the parallel. If, at this critical moment, the Church, in the personal lives and language of its representatives, proves itself to be worthy to speak and act for Christ,—which God, of His infinite mercy, grant,—these modern spirits of revolt against Divine order, like their forerunners, will be only too glad to escape from the bodies they have possessed and transport themselves with their insensate fury into a herd of swine, a base refuge into which history shows us those arrogant spirits, foiled of their intention, have ever fled. Who dare deny it? When the presence of Catholicity and its word of truth have appeared, clothed in those forms of divine majesty, and withal of divine meekness, humility and sacrifice, have not all the doctrines of rebellion against the authority of God, all the anarchical cries of revolution slunk away to hide their impotent mutterings and gnashings of teeth among that debased multitude whose fittest appellation is "swinish"—whose god is their belly and whose glory is their shame?

One thing we know, that as man and all creation beside him is the spoken word of God, imaging the divine ideals of the possible in being and life, and bearing the likeness of that Incommunicable Word "by whom all things were made, and without whom was made nothing that was made"; so we also know that His word cannot return unto him void. But it must return to Him as the echo of His own voice, for "who," exclaims holy Job, "shall answer Him?" Without that word, the life of the world would be as death, and except that infallible and all-healing word of truth reveal itself to man for his light and guidance; and as a new language with which he can speak to God in his own tongue, in vain would man seek a solution to the enigma of his own existence. For, while the Divine Word is a two-edged sword, one edge of which, like the sharp scalpel of the surgeon, wounds only to heal, and the other, with irresistible force, severs the hydra heads of error from the heart and body which sustain them and give them life, the

weapon of the human word, if it be not fashioned after the pattern of the Divine Word, is essentially blunt and inefficacious, where not destructive, simply because it is man's own attempt to give and conserve life.

There cannot be two Gods and two creations equally true; and therefore the creative word of God is alone true, and man's word is false and absurd when he does not affirm what God has spoken.

This will be plainly seen if we take man at his own word. "Every man has a right," says he, "to his own opinion." No apothegm more universal or more heartily defended than this. What does it imply? Evidently the assertion of man's self sovereignty and *right* to be governed only by his own will, and to refuse any yoke whatsoever, even that of truth, without his consent.

Only thus can we explain the intense dislike shown for the doctrine of the divine intolerance of truth always and everywhere affirmed by Catholicity. But who dares dispute the doctrine that truth, by its very nature, must be intolerant and claim absolute supremacy? Or who ever was presumptuous enough to claim for man the power of *making* any truth whatsoever, in any order?

Yet, what happens when man is brought face to face with this uncompromising word? He instantly claims the *right* to doubt, to submit it to the test of what he is pleased to call science, for so he arrogantly designates what is not science, but only inquiry and investigation. The mere knowledge of facts observed in created material nature, in the operation of its laws and relation of its powers, he assumes to be science. But he is not slow to find out that the Knower must be greater than the thing Known, and the god of the so-called scientist becomes himself. How can truth be truth if he has not affirmed it? Who is this God, creator, infinite, and almighty that is spoken of?—he is the Unknowable and therefore no object of science, no end for the intelligence of man. No wonder such sophists are proud, self-sufficient and vain as the cock who fancied the sun rose to hear him crow!

No one can affirm a truth without an act of self-denial, that is; an act of abdication of his own supremacy, and an act of adoration and acknowledgment of the supremacy of truth, of God. The original sin of man is the condition which of itself seeks to be the origin, specially of truth, and also, as a consequence, of goodness and loveliness; in a word, the ambition of originality. "I desire," says man, "to be as God, knowing good and evil. I wish to be acknowledged as an author, an origin. Therefore I am not so desirous simply to discover truth for its own sake. What I desire is the honor of its discovery, unless I could, perchance, announce a truth which no man has ever announced or discovered; and best of

all, if I could proclaim one which is entirely due to *me*; then shall I indeed be as God, and adored as God. Therefore I exercise all my faculties in endeavoring to discover if that were possible, a truth that would deny what is now worshipped and obeyed by man as truth. If I could prove that twice two do not make four, but five (or that, at any rate, they may make five in the planet of Venus or elsewhere), or if I could prove the existence of God impossible; or that what are called facts are only illusions; that God could not give evidence enough to compel belief in a miracle; that there never was any miracle; that truth itself is not at all a divine but a human affirmation, and therefore science could abolish and reverse the whole present order of truth; ah! then I shall have the honor of creating a truth, of being the original author of such a proposition. Truth would not then be my supreme master and exact my homage, willing or unwilling; but this new truth must pay me homage, and all men must ascribe supremacy to me, to my original mind, and bow down before the majesty of my intellect."

Why do men propose such absurd dicta for the whole world to believe on their affirmation—men who are, by profession, philosophers? What can possibly induce them to do this? Plainly because they are resolved to rebel against the supremacy of truth which they instinctively know and feel is not *from them*, and seek to establish their own supremacy on what *stands for truth*. But outside of truth is only the absurd. "Well, then," the proud heart of man replies, "let God be the God of truth, I will be the god of absurdity. I plainly see that if I seek for truth as truth, I am only helping to confirm the greater glory and supremacy of the Divine Author, and forcing myself to make a constant act of self-abdication and submission to His *authority*. I can create the absurd. What matter so long as I am creator, king, lord of something, even that be a nothing to God!"

The only explanation of that singular taste for, and keen enjoyment of, the absurd shown by the human mind is sin, the original sin, the satanic spirit, the sin of pride, of self-worship, or self-love, of self-glorification. Man delights in the affirmation and expression of the absurd because it is his own *quasi* creation, the child of his own imagination, which will worship him as its father and origin.

This fully explains what otherwise would be quite beyond our comprehension; the world-wide popularity of the absurd, the monstrous and the impossible, which obtains in art and literature, in our own self-worshipping and man-glorifying age. Look at the novels which command the readiest sale and whose titles are in every mouth. Which department of the most successful magazines

and newspapers is the first read by the purchaser, and lacking which others are voted as dull, tame and uninteresting? Look at our modern dramatic and scenic entertainments, if we are to judge of their reality by the highly colored placards of announcement that deface the walls of our streets to the shame not only of right reason, but of common decency, but which ensure jammed audiences and long runs, than which nothing viler or more absurd could be imagined; and which in the eyes of a better heathen civilization than our own would appear to be the work of the imbecile or the insane for the amusement of their brother lunatics.

This cultivation of the absurd and the insensate passion exhibited for it is the logical development (human progress?) of the original satanic act,—“I will to be a god and affirm *a meipso*”; and which was presented to Adam and Eve as the temptation to *know* good and evil, and hence become of good and evil the god-creator. But as there can be no truth that is not a Divine affirmation, and conversely the affirmation of the divine, Satan was obliged to affirm a lie, of which the world is forced to acknowledge he is the father, the original author. A lie, pure and simple, is the absurd. Satan is, therefore, as is man, his dupe, the god of the absurd, as God the Lord is the God of truth.

The real point at issue, then, in the discussion of human rights and liberty in their enjoyment is between the supremacy of the Divine and human word. It is the question between the Divine reason why of creation and the human reason why; the first presenting to the world the problem solved by a spectacle of order, of peace, harmony and logical consistency; exhibiting a just balance between the authority of the government and the obedience of the governed; between the infallible dicta of the Church and the reverential, yet free, faith of the believer, costing indeed man's willing self-dethronement from the chair of divine doctrine which can only be occupied without sacrilege by the Word of God, but bestowing upon mankind divine rights and assured liberty beyond the comprehension and reach of the human word; liberty without license, equality without anarchy, and fraternity without communism; while the other has never succeeded in presenting anything but a series of contradictory theories, speculations and delusive promises of a future regeneration, always to be, but never realized.

The stream can rise no higher than its source, neither can he give what he has not. How, then, without the sanction of the Divine Word, can man speak of his *sacred* rights—parental, social, political or religious—unless there be a God to whom they are sacred; unless His word of truth has consecrated them and stands ever ready with power to vindicate them?

The clear announcement of the doctrine that the liberty of man follows upon his recognition of truth was made by the world's true Regenerator when He uttered these remarkable words: "*You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.*" By whom and how that word of truth continues to be promulgated in every age the world needs not now be told. If it be grossly ignorant of more than a tithe of the blessings which it owes to her supreme presence and authority and ungratefully refuses to repay its debt of gratitude to her; if it proudly scorns to reverently kiss the hand of the martyr-victim who time and again has gone to death for its love, it at least knows, by the universal instinct of its rebellion against the supremacy even of God and of truth, where resides that calm, supreme, yet always suffering, power whose presence alone, and even the mention of whose name, is enough to arouse its antagonism and irritate it into an ill-disguised temper of mingled fear and hate.

Its champion sophists, busy with schemes of her overthrow and destruction, have never troubled their heads about the pretensions of the rank and file of the hundred and one man-forged systems of religion outside of Catholicity, knowing well that their common principle of private judgment is quite sufficient to nullify all their efforts to impose a Divine authority upon mankind, and, indeed, only serves to make them useful allies against the common enemy; and who, when unable of their own strength to sustain their attitude of rebellion against her, are quite willing to join hands in the secret compact of a satanic brotherhood with the infidel and the blasphemer of Christ in order to deal her a foul blow; whose advancement in the *degrees* of their servile fraternal (?) relations in their lodges will be found to be in an inverse ratio to their own firm faith in and spiritual submission to the God of truth and His divinely Incarnate Word.

Alone, face to face with a false and lecherous world, the Virgin Bride of God stands, seen and known of all as such, untouched, unsullied, pure as she came forth from the hand of her spouse, Himself, the Word of God, proof against all wiles, threats, and buffetings dire to wheedle, cajole, purchase, or compel a violation of her sacred honor and virtue; serene in the conscious possession of inviolability and infallibility, because she is clothed with the chaste ægis of that which yieldeth not, neither can be severed nor defiled—the seamless garment of Truth.

Thus invested with the authority of the God of truth and inspired to be for man the seer of the Divine reason why of his creation and destiny, the Church says to the world: In my authority lies the highest sanction of all human rights and surest guarantee of intellectual and moral liberty. Destroy my authority and you banish

from the earth the only infallible teacher and just vindicator of those rights, and deprive man of the freest privilege of his nature—the power of divine appeal. This we propose to show in the succeeding pages of this essay.

It has been our purpose hitherto in the course of this essay to draw our readers' attention specially to the primary and fundamental principles of human rights regarded in their source and sacred sanction, upon which is based the liberty of their exercise. We have shown that the very idea of right is founded upon a basis of truth, a theological truth, whose ideal can be no other than the Divine intention to be willingly conformed to and realized by mankind. That, as man only receives and cognizes, but cannot create or originate, truth, his affirmation of human right must be the affirmation of the Divine right in all human relations.

The human mind may be said to know facts which are the manifestations of truth, and are therefore justly called *true*, and, as such, are compulsory upon the reason as a rule of action; but the absolute essence of truth is divine, and does not depend upon either the manifestation of it in a fact or of man's apprehension of it. That is to say, facts do not make truth, but truth manifests facts. This explains why man cannot make a truth, but only cognize its manifestation.

The logical deductions of reason end with the assertion of facts which are in their nature antithetical, whose thesis is to be found in the Divine will or intention, and of which terms truth in its universality (uni-diversity) in creation and totality or unity in God is the synthesis.

The antithetical fact of human liberty is observed both as deduced from the ethical relations of man with man and as existing more or less perfectly emphasized among mankind; but the authority from which it is derived and upon whose sanction its claims are based must be referred to a higher magisterium than human reason can furnish. That magisterium must be creative, origi-native.

Thus we say, liberty is *made for* man as man is *made for* liberty. Made by whom? Evidently by the Divine Will, which posits the thesis, "human liberty." Posited for what final cause? The perfect conformity between the act divinely willed—the expression of the divine word—and the ideal of that expression, viz.: "man with liberty" in the mind of the Creator, and this is nothing else than Divine Truth.

The language of all mankind in affirming any human right is so far logical that it asserts the reason of those rights to lie in the affirmation that man was made for them and they for him. Even when it is said that they are inherent in his nature, as implied, *e.g.*,

in the American Declaration of Independence, it is only another manner of saying the same thing.

The rights of man can be deduced, indeed, by reason from the investigation of the phenomena attending those relations into which mankind instinctively falls by an ethical necessity of the life of the race,—the family, society, government and religion; but it is plain that those rights are no more the creations of human will or wisdom than those institutions themselves are. They are founded in his nature by the Divine Intention, for which reason they are justly deemed by mankind as sacred.

Whosoever, therefore, infringes just human right must make account with God, who will defend and vindicate His own Divine Will and word of truth. All deprivation of human right manifested in some form of tyranny is the consequence of the original sin of the race, which in denying the positing of the thesis by the Divine Will, and arrogating to human reason the power of creating right, must equally deny the antithetical nature of right as a Divine fact; asserting it to be something which man has made by his own will, and not something which is referable to the creative word and free will of God.

For if it were of man, evidently the synthesis cannot be expressed otherwise than as the diversity of human opinion, instead of as the totality or unity of Divine truth. One need hardly take the trouble to prove that diversity of human opinion is the same thing as the diversity of error, the logical cause and fruitful source of all tyranny.

For tyranny is the assumption of power which is not God-given nor God-sanctioned with the consequent denial of Divine responsibility; and he who dares play the part of a tyrant, by the very fact arrogates to himself what he denies not only to others, but to God Himself. He exalts himself to be his own god, but he becomes the god of the false, the unjust: and the archangelic question—“*Quis ut Deus*”—“who but God only?” is the sentence that proclaims his arrogance and his act as damnable in the sight of God and men.

Tyranny has therefore always shown itself jealous of the assumption of divine authority by either the family, the state, or the Church, and has always, as well, shown its true animus by the arrogance of its claims, and by its laughing to scorn all pretensions to cite it before a divine tribunal. Tyranny knows well who is its enemy, and who, if not successfully conquered or kept at bay, will most certainly deprive it of its prestige and power over those whom it enslaves. And this is equally true of all tyranny, whether of kings or of mobs; as true of those horrid monsters of the French Revolution and the Commune as of an English Henry VIII. and his daughter Elizabeth.

As error is, by its very nature, tyrannical; being the fruit of pride and self-deification; so tyranny, while fearing and persecuting truth, has ever been tolerant of error; if for no other reason than that error is the mother of discord, envies and jealousies, which weaken and disintegrate its own vital force, and prevents the formation of any formidable, united opposition.

The Catholic Church is right, therefore, when she proclaims truth as the ægis of human liberty; repeating the doctrine of Jesus Christ: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It is the mission of the Catholic Church not only to proclaim this doctrine to the nations, but to interpret it and to vindicate it. Even supposing liberty claimed and rights known,—which, without Divine revelation intimate to the reason or more fully declared extraneously, we assert to be impossible,—mere force is of little or no account in this question. It is doctrine which rules and fashions the world, forms the character and decides the destinies of nations.

The hope of mankind must ever rely upon the proclamation and victory of doctrines that are true. He must be a charlatan, indeed, who would pretend that erroneous or false doctrines, if not *per se* harmful, could be of any positive benefit to mankind.

Whoso says doctrine says,—that which is taught. It is the meaning of the word. There is always a teacher who sits in the chair of doctrine with a just or usurped authority. The unthinking multitude, busy with the baser cares of life, think, as they are flattered by demagogues to believe, themselves to be fully qualified to pronounce upon all questions of human right, as being the source from which all rights emanate. The popular maxim, *vox populi, vox Dei*, they translate to mean, the voice of God is what the voice of the people decides to be true, which is only saying in other words that man is the creator of truth, and that his *ipse dixit* is its ultimate criterion.

That he is led to make this arrogant assumption by the original sin of his prevaricated nature, we have already shown. Mankind is ever the slavish dupe of the satanic promise, "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Yet he is not left a helpless victim of the demon of pride, for this spiritual tyrant of man is quickly cast down from his throne by the question of the Archangel of the Word of God. *Quis ut Deus?*—Who but God only? And the speculations of sophists of every age sound like vain babblings when compared with the Divine solution of all problems that can engage the powers of the human intellect pronounced by the singer of the praises of God. "*Deus scientiarum Dominus est.*"—God is the Lord of all science.

Hence the rights of man based upon the ethical or moral order

always go hand in hand with liberty in the logical or intellectual order, and perfect liberty in either order is impossible without an infallible divine criterion. Error must enslave, as truth must give, freedom to both the intellect and will. Deny to the divine criterion of truth its legitimate authority, and at once a flood of false and illogical doctrines is poured forth upon society to be surely followed by the spread of a mephitic exhalation of demoralizing and corrupting influences in which all human rights enervated and poisoned quickly die.

The intellectual liberty which distinguishes certain epochs of history will be found to have been based upon the assumption that theology, or the science of God, is the *universal* science, offering in the knowledge of God as Supreme Reason a divine criterion for all knowledge; the light in which all facts are discerned as effects in their causes.

We, who live in an age which posterity will despise, where it does not pity it for its slavish idolatry of the intellect, gaze with wonder, as pigmies viewing giants, upon those great minds prostrate before the altar of the austere worship of truth, and look with envy upon the happy lot of a people whose age realized in the enjoyment of true liberty of mind and heart, almost to triumph, the Beatitudes of Christ.

He who is able to trace the all-powerful influence of doctrine upon the social condition of the nations cannot fail to contrast the former civilization, indebted, as it was, to the willing homage paid by the human intellect to the legitimate authority of divine truth for its stability, order, freedom and moral elevation, with the present disturbed, unstable condition of modern society in which every human right is put in peril, the family relation vitiated and its constitution undermined by divorce and unnamable crimes, the rights of property threatened by anarchy and socialism, the political order subjected to the tyrannical encroachments of heartless capitalists and the ambitious schemes of the corrupt creatures they elect to serve their own base ends, while the ignorant masses follow with superstitious credulity one religious fanatic after another, who are forever reforming their illogical and inconsistent creeds.

Our intelligent reader, who has followed us thus far in the statement of these clear and evident principles, will not fail to draw for himself the undeniable deductions from their consideration, viz. : The necessity of a universal, infallible authority possessed of divinely discriminative and judicial powers, lacking which the world would be condemned to the tyranny of error, without the benefit of appeal. Without such an authority the Divine intention could neither be clearly made known to and willingly obeyed by man, nor, when disputed, fairly interpreted and, when infringed, justly vindicated.

This is the claim of Catholicity, and, as all the world knows, of Catholicity only.

Strangely enough, the confession of this necessity is sometimes unwillingly made by her enemies. We find an instance of this in a lecture delivered a few years ago with the express intent of denouncing the Catholic Church. Said the lecturer: "As searchers after truth we must acknowledge some standard, and appeal to some recognized authority. Without this we must follow either our own mental bias, or else become the prey of every man who shall be bold enough to declare that *he* has and holds the truth of God."¹

Humanity everywhere and at all times seeking for truth and struggling against the tyranny of error claims from God a universal Teacher of the truth and a universal Judge of error: infallible as both. Not self-constituted, nor self-authorized, but taught of God, and sanctioned by Him, whose infallibility and authority must therefore be divine. Only such a teacher is competent to judge between man and man, between truth and error, and always decide for the truth, else certitude would be impossible and dispute endless. The rights of man are both universally and indisputably true, and thus the same teacher must be invested with the power to condemn error, and require complete submission to its judgment. This, again, is the claim of Catholicity, and of Catholicity alone.

It will not be irrelevant to say, just here, that the attribute of infallibility enjoyed by the Church is not dependent upon the intellectual acquirements of those who at any time form the body of the living Church in this world, taken either singly in the person of its head or in the aggregate of particular portions, or of the whole body of the faithful, though as a fact the Catholic Church has ever embraced the majority of those men of great learning who have honored the age in which they lived by their superior philosophical discernment and profound judicial wisdom.

All men are by nature fallible, and no aggregate amount of the learning of fallible men could ever produce infallibility. It is a divine attribute with which the God of truth has invested His Church as the bride of Christ; Himself the infallible Word of God. Her language is indeed the language of men, but her word is the word of God, because her spirit is the spirit of all truth. Possessing, as every Catholic does, the divine touchstone of truth; being united in the solidarity of an infallible society, his faith is humanly

¹ Lecture by Rev. Dr. Harwood, being one of a series denominated "Price Lectures," a legacy having been left by a person of that name in order to defray the cost of an annual lecture, "whose object shall be to contradict the errors and superstitions of the Church of Rome." Boston, Mass., is the intellectual centre about which an audience is annually gathered to hear these "contradictions."

reasonable as his reason is divinely faithful. This harmony between the human and divine intelligence, which the virtue of the principle of reversibility in Christ restores, is the basis of the capacity for infallible certitude which is one of the *characters* of the Christian. As he is included in the Christian, divine, *essentially* logical, because infallible, order in which he is supernaturally born, he possesses the criterion of certitude which enables him to discern and correct the aberrations which are possible in the human, *accidentally* illogical, because fallible, order in which he is naturally born. So, as the Apostle says, "as all in Adam die, so shall all in Christ be made alive," we may also say: As all in Adam are made fallible, so all in Christ shall be made infallible. As "the pillar and ground of the truth," the Church is then the immovable foundation as well as the sure support of the whole arch of truth in its synthetic harmony and unity.

Hence arises a singular and even miraculous result. The authority possessed by the Church is one which inspires a willing, loving obedience, the only meritorious homage which truth accepts. In the spirit of that loving obedience man overcomes his natural demand to believe nothing without his own consent, sacrifices his predilection for error, renounces his own self-sovereignty, and brings his reason into accord with that of others.

Thence arises that greatest of all wonders, the unity of faith and reason among Catholics in all things infallibly decided by the divine authority of the Church. Most wonderful also is the fact that the more humble the submission of man's intelligence to that authority, the more perfect becomes his intellectual freedom to seek and know the truth, freedom from the worst of all shackles of the intellect, self-conceit and pride.

Inconsistency and illogical reasoning, even upon the most ordinary topics, is one of the most plainly-marked characteristics both of the conversations and writings of those living in communities whose system of education is based upon the idolatry of the intellect, falsely and unphilosophically conferring upon the intellect that imperium which is only enjoyed by the will. They are like ships without rudder or compass, beaten about by every wind of doctrine. It is the bane of the vaunted secular education of our time. The consequences are patent upon the face of the pages of our current literature "as thick as leaves in Vallombrosa"; but in logical consistency, and as serving the highest and most worthy purpose of literature, the search after and praise of truth must be condemned, with rare exceptions, as utterly valueless.

Truth cannot give its glory to another; and the secret of this inconsistent, illogical frame of mind which prevails among those lacking divine faith, is referable to the original, primal cause of all

error and absurdity, the capital sin of the race, self-glorification to the dethronement of God and His divine authority. Centuries ago this principle was announced by the Divine Founder of Catholicity when he said: "*Qui à semetipso loquitur gloriam propriam quærit. Sed qui quærit gloriam ejus qui misit eum, hic verax est.*" He that speaketh from himself seeketh his own glory, but he that seeketh the glory of Him that sent him, he is true."

Error must follow after pride, and produce confusion of doctrine among the leaders of thought, destroying all hope of unity of faith among the masses, who, becoming enraged with their false prophets, turn upon them and rend them. As has been well said: "Sophists are followed by revolutions, and revolutions are succeeded by hangmen."

Prophetic were the words of the mother of the Incarnate Word of truth: "*Dispersit superbos mente cordis sui.*" He hath divided the proud against each other in the conceit of their heart."

On the contrary, humility is one of the most remarkable traits observable in the writings of the great doctors in the Catholic schools of theology and philosophy, whose phenomenal learning has been the admiration of all ages; and we dare assert and challenge contradiction that among all classes of Catholics, even in the humbler walks of life, there is found, in a vastly superior degree to what is observed among those who are without faith (which is begotten of humility of heart), that plain, direct, straightforward, honest form of speech, indicative of an ability to apprehend logical argument, and which can only proceed from the enjoyment of superior intellectual liberty. It is this liberty which marvellously preserves them from the influence of the pretentious and subtle sophistries thrust upon them under every guise in speeches, newspaper and magazine articles, and in the entertaining books of the day, to say nothing of the over-much lauded works of graver import. It is not easy to mislead and thus intellectually enslave a faithful Catholic by fallacious reasoning. He possesses the touchstone which detects the presence of all error—his divine faith. But if he can once be induced to eat of the tree of good and evil, and revolt against the divine authority of the Church in the hope of becoming "as a god," he falls an easy prey to the first *ism* which offers itself to him as a stepping-stone to his own self-enthronement. Every heresy is the child of intellectual pride, and in itself necessarily an illogical and self-condemnatory act, assuming the authority and right to decide what is and what ought to be divine truth on its own confessedly fallible judgment, which in the same breath as "private judgment" it invests with practical pretensions of infallibility.

Heresy ever recruits its adherents from among the ranks of those

in whose eyes the forbidden fruit of self-sovereignty seems fair to behold and sweet to the taste. That it is quickly disintegrated and broken up into discordant, warring sects is not surprising. What would be surprising and even miraculous would be the preservation of unity by any heresy. "*Dispersit superbos mente cordis sui.*"

The view of infallibility that we have presented is more than a sufficient answer to those who ignorantly pretend that the submission of the intellect required by such a doctrine either abridges or nullifies its free exercise. The gravamen of the complaint at bottom is not that the matter upon which the so assumed infallible decision of the Church falls is or is not true.

Mankind would never object to the Church deciding whatsoever seemed good in her eyes, provided she was willing to acknowledge that she is, after all, as fallible as any individual man or other organization of men. What the heart of man is naturally jealous of is his own authority, and what he questions is the right to demand the galling acknowledgment from him that God is the Lord of *all* science, and that there is any extrinsic authority whatsoever which requires of him, by its own right, to believe anything on that authority. This is the secret of the railing antagonism shown by so-called scientists to the doctrine of infallibility. They do not want God to be the magister who teaches them, as He certainly does by being the author of reason, any truth which it is possible for reason to certify either as a fact of experimental observation or as an application conformable to any laws deduced by it from the observation of facts; for, on the same principle that God, as *Dominus scientiarum*, could require belief in the simplest proposition, or the most commonly known physical laws, he could also require belief in facts beyond all human observation, or in truths affirmed as applications conformable to laws not deduced, neither deducible, by human reason.

Knowing that man is not, neither can be, the author or origin of truth, the self-crowned princes of the kingdom of science in our day are envious of the authority and originality of God, and so attempt to comfort themselves with the thought that, there being some irrefragable laws exhibiting in their application indisputably true facts, these laws, and consequently (why not?) the facts also, are equally binding upon God as upon them, and boldly draw a conclusion, which even the premises granted will not warrant, that the essential nature of truth, as well as its diverse affirmations in created existences and their life are independent of the Divine Being and of His will—things which He has not affirmed, and over which He can exercise no right in their regard superior to man. This is the spirit which flatters the pride of man that he is "as a god."

But once that they abdicate this self-deification and acknowledge God to be Himself the essence and reason of all truth, there is an end to all dispute of the divine *right* to require submission of the human intellect to an infallible authority, and also an end to the possibility of a supposition that anything whatsoever can be true if it contradicts that infallible authority, or conversely, that the infallible authority could possibly require the submission of the mind to anything that is not true. No longer is it deemed irrational to "believe firmly without doubting" truths proposed by Divine authority which in their nature are out of the range of human discussion or experiment; but, on the contrary, it is seen that it is reason itself, freed from satanic envy and pride, which dictates such belief to be as necessary and binding as are the authority and its right to require it.

The assumed antagonism, therefore, between faith and science which is so eagerly cherished and so industriously presented under every guise to the ignorant multitude in order to discredit and nullify the divine magisterium of God and the Church, is absurd, impossible, and false.

The practical exercise of this divine attribute by the Church in the fulfilment of her mission in the conduct of human affairs, by the proclamation and vindication of God-given human rights in the social, political, and religious order, and which has given to the world all the justly prized blessings of a civilization indisputably due to her Divine establishment and power, itself coeval with, and both the logical and ethical development of, the act of the incarnation of the Divine Word of truth and love lies before us written upon the pages of history for nineteen centuries.

The strongest and really invulnerable proof of her having been all and done all she claims to have been and to have accomplished, will be found to lie in the fact that she has survived all attempts at her destruction, has succeeded in her work in so wonderful a manner, has miraculously kept her unity of organization and faith, has civilized the nations, reduced tyrants to subjection, protected the downtrodden, freed the slave, blessed and comforted the poor, confirmed authority in government, sanctified obedience, regulated society, and led millions up the difficult and thorny paths of virtue and heroic sanctity, not because of the divine truths she announced as the vicar of the Word of God; not because of the miracles she performed; not because her doctrine was, in fact, the highest and holiest and most marvellously logical and convincing that it is possible to conceive of; but, paradoxical as it may seem, *in spite of all these things*.

For it is precisely against infallible truth, the manifestation of miraculous power and the exhibition of holiness, moral purity, and

devotion to justice that mankind has ever arrayed itself in a phalanx of opposition and deadly hate; stirring up persecutions, confiscations, banishments and exile, penal disabilities, secularizing by force and fraud the institutions of the family, government, education, and even religion; thus robbing them of their divine virtue and strength; denying both the facts and the possibility of miracles in the very face of them; poisoning the wells of truth by pouring into their pure waters one stream after another of atheistic philosophy, and covering their clear, pellucid surface with the thick scum of doubt; denouncing all heroic virtue and self-denial from which society is all the while reaping unnumbered blessings as unnatural, and the perfection of holiness as fraudulent hypocrisy; tearing down with revolutionary violence and iconoclastic brutality what the Church has for centuries laboriously and patiently built up; sacrilegiously robbing the fruits of sacrifice made for the spiritual and the eternal to aggrandize the sensual and the temporal. But, when they have done their worst, astounded and baffled, they are forced to see that they themselves, by her crucifixion at their hands, have contributed, through the divine mystery of suffering's all healing, purifying, exalting, and irresistibly attractive power, the very means of their own defeat and of her victorious resurrection.

Yes, it is the cross, at once symbol and instrument of sacrifice and death, that has conquered and will ever conquer the world, the flesh and the devil. Truth can be denied or betrayed, miracles can be ruled out of testimony, sanctity can be travestied or ridiculed, but the cross of suffering and death has that invincible and magical virtue which conquers those in whose hands it is a weapon of offence, and transforms the now crucified victim into a victorious Saviour of the self-conquered enemy; the cross, the only power that overcomes man and wins God, whose name is a word of mystery, interpreted in the language of the world to mean slavery, shame, and death; but in the language of the Church, freedom, glory, and life.

THE POPES OF THE RENAISSANCE AND THEIR LATEST HISTORIANS.

Ludwig Pastor's *Geschichte der Päpste*, Vol. I.

Canon Creighton's *History of the Papacy*, Vols. I., II.

Leopold Ranke's *History of the Popes*, Vol. I.

THE English-speaking Catholic who would read a connected story of the Popes is still dependent on a translation of the amiable, if not devotional, work of M. Artaud de Montor, or of the no less vigorous and quite as unmodern Abbé Darras. The non-Catholic whose reason-loving, light-seeking mind is not satisfied with the family version, unrevised, of the life of Alexander VI., and the comprehensive synthesis of that homœopath of truth, Dr. Draper, is none the less at a loss for books after he has read the time-honored work of Ranke. Having exhausted these not inexhaustible sources, Catholic and non-Catholic are thrown back on an odd volume of Hurter, Voigt, Bowden, the searching inquiries of Mr. Archibald Brower, formerly Counsellor of the Inquisition, or the hurried summaries of the Church-history, or the anti-Popery pamphlet. The more serious student, sufficiently equipped to deal with French, German, and Italian works, has been hardly less hampered, so scattered was the material—largely used with the sole purpose of illustrating political history—so considerable the connected and fragmentary publication of new sources, so various the criticism of authorities, and so evidently incomplete the discovered testimony concerning certain individuals, certain facts, and certain periods. To have one period rounded, all the so collected material critically studied, grouped, brought out into the full light of day, honestly, artlessly, with mastery, without any of the false glamor that is bred of fine words, or pretty philosophy—to have the whole method of the work exposed, and to hold in one's hand a key giving entrance to the worker's study, a catalogue noting every step of his progress, is, assuredly, something to be deeply thankful for. And this it is which Ludwig Pastor promises to do for the history of the Popes during that most eventful period of time extending from the close of the Middle Ages to our own day. This it is which he has already done, especially for the life and times of Martin V., Eugenius IV., Nicholas V., and Calixtus III., viz., from 1417 to 1458.

Much as we may feel inclined to regret that there has been no

studious English work dealing with the history of the Popes during the last five centuries, and difficult as it may seem at first sight to explain the fact, we shall, on reflection, find little cause for regret and as little difficulty in explaining the fact. True liberty fled from England when the Pope's rightful authority was usurped. Robbed, persecuted, powerless to do any leisurely intellectual work, the little patriot band of faithful Catholics that held the field against all comers was necessarily, conscientiously, patriotically led to devote itself to the defence and inculcation of the great principles on whose existence the very life of Christianity depends. Hence it is that to-day, among English Catholic scholars, there are probably more learned men equipped for a theological and historical thesis proving the divine foundation of the Papacy, and showing its development in the first ages of the Church, than for an authoritative exposition of the action of the Popes in the modern life of the world. Habit and tradition play as large a part in the education, line of thought, literary effort, of a class or a nation as of an individual. As far as anti-Papal England was concerned, once force had strangled freedom of conscience, and the statute, the jail, the gibbet, the inquisitor, the official school-book and teacher, had made a history-primer to please benignant, ingenuous princes, there was every reason not to handle a dangerous subject critically, and no encouragement to deal with Popes in any wise, except as moral monsters from whom the spiritual offspring of the impeccable Henry VIII., and of the white-souled Elizabeth, had been providentially wrested, or as political enemies and anti-Christian usurpers, whose apocalyptic ending, foretold in clear words, was patent to every blind man. "It is," indeed, "no wonder that under the circumstances the place of History among the studies of the University became worse rather than better, or like that of Moral Philosophy, was lost altogether."¹ These words are quoted from the learned Bishop Stubbs, though with an application wholly different from the one given in his text. Their use here only serves to illustrate how searchers after truth may agree in a conclusion, though their judgment has been exercised on widely separate links in a chain of facts.

In France the modern revival of historical studies was first apparent, thanks to the appealing voice that never ceased to plead from every page of the noble "monkish" collections. The Germans, though the second to enter the lists, hold no second place to-day. Probably to their influence—for they have critically discussed periods of English history altogether neglected by Englishmen—we owe the more recent development of a school of English

¹ *Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History*, Oxford, 1886, p. 6.

historians, that gives promise of valuable work in the future, and that has already done honorable work. Just here it seems well to ask: Will our century, as so many claim, be known hereafter pre-eminently as a "scientific" age? The answer seems to be a loud No! if we consider the wonderful activity of the human mind during the latter half of the century in the way of a thorough study of history—an activity that is daily spreading in extent and growing in intensity. Italy, Spain, Russia, Hungary, Belgium are up and doing. In the last decade of this century the publication of sources, and of critical generalizations of periods and institutions, and of critical studies of persons, will add, beyond measure, to the value of existing material, and shed a piercing light on the whole field of modern history. When after generations seek a word to qualify the mental activity of the nineteenth century, so much are men the slaves of old words, it is not unlikely they will recur to a hackneyed term, and that our age will be known as that of the historical renaissance.

The new character which modern history has assumed necessarily, since it has been generally recognized as a treasury of knowledge and a well-spring of truth, instead of a sewer serving to fructify the soil of dynastic hates, princely or party ambitions, denominational prejudices and passions, infidel scurrility and bravado, is as noticeable in the work of contemporary Englishmen as in that of Germans and Frenchmen. Not that unsound and trashy books called histories are uncommon in England, but that we see the educated men putting Hume, and Gibbon, and Macaulay, and Carlyle, and Froude—great names—out of the university of history, into which they had coolly pushed themselves—rooming them, meanwhile, comfortably in the spacious and liberal college of literature. Freeman, Brewer, Green, Gairdner, Gardiner, Stubbs, —to mention only a few intelligent and persistent laborers—have done much in a serious, temperate, scholarly way to reform the methods of history writing in England.

Confining themselves principally to the study of the records of their own country, the later English historians have hardly ventured, as yet, to deal with the history of continental Europe; nor, if we except Canon Creighton's "History of the Papacy," have they attempted any critical history of the Popes in modern times. Indeed, it is to be regretted that Mr. Creighton had not delayed the publication of his interesting work some few years. It might have gained in completeness and in breadth, and it would probably have given more effective testimony to the excellence of English when compared with German scholarship, as we see it exemplified in Ludwig Pastor's "History of the Popes."

Mr. Creighton's "History of the Papacy during the Period of

the Reformation,"¹ of which four volumes have appeared, begins, properly speaking, with the year 1378, and the election of Urban VI. to the Papal throne, and ends with the close of the Lateran Council, 1517. Comparing these dates with the title of the history, we see that Mr. Creighton uses the word "Reformation" in a sense peculiar to himself. Nowhere does he define his meaning. If we turn to the "Preface" to Vol. I., we are not enlightened. "My aim in this book," says Mr. Creighton, "is to bring together materials for a judgment of the change which came over Europe in the 16th century, to which the name of 'The Reformation' is loosely given. I have attempted to do this from a strictly historical point of view,—by which I mean that I have contented myself with watching events and noting the gradual development of affairs. I have taken the history of the Papacy as the central point for my investigation, because it gives the largest opportunity for a survey of European affairs as a whole. I have not begun with the actual crisis itself, but have gone back to trace the gradual formation of opinions which were long simmering below the surface before they found actual expression. I purpose, if opportunity should be given me, to continue my survey in succeeding volumes to the dissolution of the Council of Trent." In the "Preface" to Vol. III. we read: "I am not writing a history of Italy, or of the Renaissance, or of the Reformation, but of the Papacy" From these two quotations it is apparent that, ordinarily, Mr. Creighton uses the term "Reformation" as loosely as other people, while, in the title of his work, he uses it still more loosely. Judging from his treatment of "the gradual development of affairs" in Vols. I. and II., it is possible that he thinks it more exact to carry the "Reformation" period backward to the moment when he can first "trace the gradual formation of opinions which were long simmering below the surface before they found actual expression." Why, however, fix on so late a date as 1378? The gradual formation of these simmering opinions can be traced to a much earlier date. There is no good reason why a historian should not be as logical in his title and preface as in his judgment of facts or persons. Logic is not, however, the most marked characteristic of the school in which Canon Creighton was educated. Like Bishop Stubbs, he avoids the "romantic" in narration, but finds place for it in the syllogism of facts.

Reviewing Canon Creighton's earlier volumes, Mr. T. Hodgkin² gives an estimate of the scope of the history as it stands to-day. "As Ranke's 'History of the Popes' takes up the thread of the

¹ *History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation.* By M. Creighton, M.A. London, 1882-1887, 4 vols.

² *MacMillan's Magazine*, vol. xlvii., p. 381.

story at the Council of Trent and continues it through the 16th and 17th centuries, it will be seen that this book (which treats the subject somewhat in Ranke's style and on similar lines) will, when completed and taken in conjunction with the German historian's work, furnish the reader with a complete history of 'the Great Latin Patriarchate' from the days of our Edward III. to the accession of the house of Brunswick." Unfortunately, the "conjunction" of Creighton and Ranke will not, as Mr. Hodgkin dreams, "furnish the reader with a complete history of" the Popes from the days of Edward to the accession of the Brunswickers, though Mr. Creighton does give a view of certain sides of Papal and non-Papal history during the century and a half preceding the so called Reformation, and does end where Ranke begins.

The reader who is not acquainted with Mr. Creighton's work may form a right estimate of its completeness with the aid of Lord Acton, certainly within his range of studies the most refreshing, informed, suggestive, historical critic that we English-speaking people have. Clear of vision and delicately frank in the expression of his judgments, he is gifted with a rare spirit of moderation and an enviable command of refined, diplomatic language, whose effect is immediate and lasting. Reviewing the two later volumes of Mr. Creighton, in the *English Historical Review* (July, 1887, pp. 571-581), of which, by the way, Canon Creighton is the editor, Lord Acton values "The History of the Papacy during the Reformation" in these words: "Next to the merits of moderation and sobriety which the preface rightly claims, their first characteristic is the economy of evidence and the severity with which the raw material is repressed and so kept out of sight as not to divert the reader's attention or turn his pleasure into toil. The author prefers the larger public that takes history in the shape of literature, to scholars whose souls are vexed with the insolubility of problems, and who get their meals in the kitchen."

Though Lord Acton's criticism is based on the later volumes, the reader need have no hesitation in applying it broadly to the whole work. The weakness of Mr. Creighton's method is cleverly brought out in the following passage from Lord Acton's review: "There is some risk in attempting a smooth narration of transactions belonging to an age so rich in disputed matter and dispersed material and quick with the causes of the Reformation. As the author rarely takes stock or shows the limit of his lore, the grateful student, on whom proofs are not obtruded, cannot tell whether they abound, and may be led wrongly and injuriously to doubt whether the sources of information and suggestion have been fully explored." In other words, cruder words, Mr. Creighton's "History of the Papacy" is a "popular" history,—a "faith history," so

to say,—that kind of a history in which the writer is apparently his own chiefest authority, a history whose “economy of evidence” and severe repression of proofs protects “the larger public that takes history in the shape of literature” from any troublesome doubts, but sadly vexes the soul of the inquiring student.

Von Ranke prepared his readers for his studies of the Popes in the 16th and 17th centuries by a single chapter of some thirty short pages, wherein he assumed to sketch the development of the Papacy from the year 1 of the Christian era to the year 1500. After the same fashion, Mr. Creighton, in something less than fifty pages, gives his version of the same story up to the year 1378. While the two chapters that make up this “Introduction” gently and speedily carry the reader into the agreeable flow of the later narrative, they do not rightly prepare him to acquire a just estimate of Church or State during the fourteen centuries “so rich in disputed matter and dispersed material.” Mr. Creighton finds the Church and the Pope in history, but in the Popes he seems to see only the founders, the makers and, in good time, the blind or providential destroyers of a Papal monarchy. With this monarchy, more as a civil than as a religious power, and just because he is pleased to view it more as a civil than as a religious power, Mr. Creighton is principally engaged. It was De Maistre, who said so many bright things, that advised near-sighted men not to read history. “They lose their time,” said he. Will not some witty Englishman enlarge the proverb so that it may include writers of history? Time is so valuable.

The defects of Mr. Creighton’s “Introduction” are nowhere more apparent than in the few pages dealing with Hildebrand before and after his election to the Papal chair.¹ Here we have facts, it is true, but, at the same time, an economic repression of material that deserved more generous treatment. The picture of Hildebrand is not unsympathetic. The artist has caught the features, but not the expression, the soul of the man. Nor does he show forth the living age in right relation to Pope, Church, or State. A professed “Introduction” that is not an introduction places a stranger in a false position. The student and the scholar may be safely left to provide for themselves. Twenty pages of Döllinger’s slight sketch, “The Pope and the States of the Church,”² will help to give life to Mr. Creighton’s earlier pages. The reader who is willing to take some history in a form that does not deserve to be called unliterary will certainly lose nothing if he omits Mr. Creighton’s introduction, and replaces it by the first one hundred and fifty pages of the first volume of Cesare Cantù’s “Gli

¹ Vol. I., pp. 14-17.

² See *The Church and the Churches*, London, 1862, pp. 336-353.

Eretici d'Italia,"¹ a work which, though it has served students for nearly a quarter of a century, is still deserving of an English translation. The admirable and learned work of Cardinal Hergenröther, "*Catholic Church and Christian State*,"² whose reading might well be made obligatory on all unfledged "philosophers" in our colleges, will cast a larger light on the changing, intricate, though not confused relations of the Papacy with Christendom and its temporal rulers. The larger public that finds pleasure in a pleasing literary dress, as well as the student who seeks for deep, enlivening, suggestive thought, a broad view of the past and the present, and an intimate acquaintance with the best material, will surely prefer to introduce himself to the great Hildebrand through the good offices of the learned and original Mr. Lilly.³

The different effect of Mr. Creighton's "*History*" on two very different minds, as shown by a further extract from Lord Acton's criticism and from Mr. T. Hodgkins' notice, may serve to point a moral. "Mr. Creighton," says Lord Acton,⁴ "is not striving to prove a case, or burrowing towards a conclusion, but wishes to pass through scenes of raging controversy and passion with a serene curiosity, a suspended judgment, a divided jury, and a pair of white gloves." The measure is perfect, with the slightest qualification. While not "striving" to prove a case, Mr. Creighton certainly has a case, and a close eye on the jury. He may not be "burrowing to a conclusion," but it is only because he prefers to glide. Otherwise there is nothing to be added to or taken away from Lord Acton's acute criticism. Mr. Creighton preserves his gloves almost intact. They are seemingly just a size too small for a historian of the Papacy during the 14th and 15th centuries.

Mr. Hodgkin is a historian, the writer of a not unpopular book on "*Italy and her Invaders*." He does not wear gloves of any color. His criticism is reminiscent of the "drum and the trumpet." He has read Mr. Creighton's story of the Great Schism; and this is what he has learned. "Not a gleam of honest, conscientious difference in principle ennobles the contest between Rome and Avignon. It is simply a question which of two greedy old men shall have the right of standing at the turnpike-gate and taking toll of the wayfarers to heaven, which shall have the Annates flowing into his treasury, which shall have the power of reserving the fattest bishopric in Christendom for his nephews and their friends."

¹ *Gli Eretici d'Italia*, Torino, 1865, 2 vols.

² *Catholic Church and Christian State*, London, 1876, 2 vols.

³ See "The Turning-Point of the Middle Ages," being Chapter II. of Vol. I. of *Chapters in European History*, London, 1886.

⁴ *Eng. Hist. Review*, l. c., p. 527. Full justice to Lord Acton's review could only be done by a reprint. Lord Acton's reviews are real pages of history.

"We cannot afford to speak contemptuously of any sort of knowledge," says Bishop Stubbs, "and God forbid that we should speak contemptuously or hypercritically of any honest worker"¹—and, in this spirit, we quote Mr. Hodgkin, word for word. But imagine Canon Creighton's feelings as he read this confession of the historian of "Italy and her Invaders!" Doubtless De Maistre's proverb rushed to his lips.

The notion of Mr. Creighton's work conveyed in this extract is more than unjust to him. Whatever his sins of commission or omission, he is always moderate, fair in statement, as far as his statement goes, honest and temperate in his judgments of persons and acts. Indeed, if the "History of the Papacy" had no other value, it would deserve to be read as a model of tolerance and reserve. Mr. Creighton can rightly claim that he has not allowed his judgment "to be warped by a desire to be picturesque and telling." "What we want to see," to quote the always quotable Bishop Stubbs,² "is men applying to history and politics the same spirit in which wise men act in their discipline of themselves; not to cease to be partisans, not to cease to hold and utter strong opinions, but to be as careful in their party behavior and in their support of their opinions as they are in their behavior in social circles, their conversation in social life." And it is in this spirit that Mr. Creighton has written. He deserves the largest credit, and there can be no hesitation in agreeing with Lord Acton, that, "it is by the spirit and not the letter that his book will live."

When Ludwig Pastor's later volumes have appeared we shall be able to compare his work with the history of Ranke, which during more than fifty years has been the standard modern history of the Popes for German and English non-Catholics. As it is, Pastor is still dealing with events that happened full sixty years before the period at which Ranke begins the "History of the Popes." For its time, Ranke's history was a rarely good book, a surprise to Protestants of all denominations, who had been brought up on a literature of fables and abuse, and a greater surprise to Catholics, who had patiently reached a conclusion that Luther and the princes had knifed truth beyond the hope of recovery. This was her first gasp, and she showed wonderful signs of vitality. With all its popularity, the German "Ranke" has not gotten beyond a seventh edition. The movement of the Papacy during the last half of the present century disturbed some of the German historian's most settled views; just as the movement of the Papacy during the coming century will disturb the settled or the hesitating views of a crowd of more and of less learned people. Ranke amended his

¹ *L. c.*, p. 13.

² *L. c.*, p. 20.

title and modified from time to time, in small ways, his studies of the Renaissance and his sketch of the Popes of the 18th and 19th centuries. At last, realizing the importance of the material that had accumulated since 1834, and the consequent decline in value of his statement of facts and of his judgments, he conceived the idea of a wholly new edition, worthy of the scholarship of the day. Considering his age and the revolution in history-writing directly resulting from the action of Leo XIII. in throwing open the Vatican archives in 1884, no one will regret that Ranke's scheme was not carried out. Pastor's work promises to give us the history that was needed, and that is more than Ranke could have done under the circumstances.

It is especially curious to note Ranke's estimate of his own moral, or intellectual, or religious—in any case, personal—fitness for writing the history of the Popes. "An Italian or Roman, a Catholic,¹ would enter on the subject in a spirit very different from mine. By indulging in expressions of personal veneration or, perhaps, in the present state of opinion, of personal hatred, he would give to his work a peculiar and, no doubt, more brilliant coloring; on many points he would be more elaborate, more ecclesiastical, more local. In these respects, a Protestant, a North German, cannot be expected to compete with him. He regards the Papal power with feelings of mere indifference; and must, from the first, renounce that warmth of expression which arises from partiality or hostility; and which might, perhaps, produce a certain impression in Europe. For mere matter of ecclesiastical or canonical detail, we can have no true sympathy; on the other hand, our position affords us different and, if I am not mistaken, purer and less partial views of history. For what is there in the present day that can make the history of the Papal power of importance to us? Not its particular relation to ourselves, for it no longer exercises any essential influence, nor does it create in us solicitude of any kind; the times are past in which we had anything to fear; we now feel ourselves perfectly secure. Popery can now inspire us with no other interest than what results from its history and its former influence." With this apology before us it is easy to form an estimate of history and historians before Ranke's day. The great German could afford to be honest "because he was not a Catholic and because modern Germans had nothing to fear from the dying Papacy!"

Ranke's honesty can be freely admitted, but unbounded honesty by itself will not make a historian. Ranke assumed that the main thing in his favor was his Protestantism, while in reality this was his chief defect. No man who is not a Catholic can write a true

¹ Author's Preface, Foster's Translation, p. xvii.

history of the Popes. And this fact, patent to any scientific mind, is now broadly acknowledged by non-Catholic thinkers. Right reason would have forced the general acceptance of this principle in time; Pastor's "History" has already made it evident. Zarncke's "Literarisches Centralblatt,"¹ reviewing Pastor's history at some length, says: "He is a Catholic, and in his presentation never disavows the Church's standpoint. But this standpoint in no wise clouds his view of historical truth. He honestly seeks to do justice to phenomena and persons which, exactly because of his view of the Church, he cannot easily sympathize with. Indeed, in many respects, this Church standpoint undoubtedly qualifies him for a more correct and becoming conception of persons and circumstances than would be possible for one-sided non-Catholic inquirers and writers of history." What a pleasure it is to see and to feel the world move! He who would write the history of the Church or the Popes must needs be a member of the Church, saturated with the spirit of the Church, filled with the soul of the Church, learned in the doctrines of the Church, loving truth as only the Church loves it, bold, honest and fair, as only the "Papist" dare be. Then, given judgment and the other necessary talents, the South African may be trusted with the work as safely as the North German.

Ludwig Pastor does not tell us, in his preface, where he was born, nor what religion he professes. He saw the need of a new history of the Popes, and preparing himself for so serious an undertaking by the most thorough studies, he offers the public the first volume. Here is a "History" committed to the world by a historian just as the chemist presents a "Chemistry," an astronomer a volume of "Astronomy," a geologist a work on "Geology." Pastor is not writing for those only "who now feel themselves perfectly secure," or for those who see the Papacy "tottering to its fall." He is giving to all men the latest results of the science of history. Instead of his human genealogy we have the record of his intellectual genealogy—a list of the five hundred and thirty odd books and collections and the thousand and more manuscripts distributed in one hundred private and public libraries and official archives, that he has consulted and used in the pages of this single volume, "dense with new knowledge," as Lord Acton says. In order that the estimate we have given of Mr. Creighton's history may not admit of question, and in order that every reader may be able to see, once for all, the vastly different methods of the scientific and the "popular" school of historians, we shall quote a

¹ See No. 44, p. 1522, 1886.

couple of passages from Mr. Creighton's preface to his first volume:¹ "The circumstances of my life have not allowed me to make much research for new authorities, which in so large a field would have been almost impossible. What I have found in MS. was not of much importance." "My work has been done under the difficulties which necessarily attend one who lives far from great libraries, and to whom study is the occupation of leisure hours, not the main object of life." The modest unpretentiousness of these statements will hinder any fair man from dealing with Mr. Creighton's work hypercritically, but they bear witness to its slight character when compared with the work of a historian whose life has not been spent far from great libraries, to whom study is the main occupation, the circumstances of whose life have made it *seem* a duty to spare no labor in the search for new authorities, and *who* has found material of considerable importance in manuscript after manuscript. "The inner mind of the Papacy has to be perused through many other collections pertaining to the several countries, churches, and religious orders," says Lord Acton justly, and Pastor has, at least, perused the collections.

A pupil of the great Johannes Janssen, we are not surprised at Pastor's diligence, thoroughness, compactness, detail, sacrificing drudgery. He has sought new sources not alone in Germany, but also in Austria, Hungary, Italy, Belgium, France, and England. Before him no historian of the Popes had free access to the secret archives of the Papacy, to the manuscript collections of the Vatican library, of the Inquisition, the Propaganda, the library of St. Peter and of the Sixtina. Neither Ranke, nor Gregorovius, nor Von Reumont, nor Mr. Creighton, made any use of the valuable sources which have supplied Pastor with more than two hundred and twenty-five important manuscripts. In an appendix he prints no less than eighty-six documents heretofore unpublished, and these are only a beginning. In the succeeding volumes he will print a large number of hitherto unused official acts, letters, and bulls, illustrating the period he has so successfully studied.

Pastor's "Introduction," as the reader may readily imagine, is not, after the fashion of a Creighton or a Ranke, a "*tendenz*" chapter out of a "popular" history or a handbook. He is about to write the history of the Popes during a period of transition, when the so-called Middle Ages are ushering in the "Modern" era, when an old body of ideas, feeling the breath of a new life, begins to develop fresh and active organs and faculties, gathers physical and intellectual force with time, and day by day effects a visible change in men's views of life, eternity, government, morality, and culture. The centre of this powerful factor in the history of the

¹ *History of the Papacy*, Vol. I., p. viii.

modern world is Italy, the ever ungracious home of the Popes. There, under the impetus of the Christian Petrarch, and the not un-Christian Zola of his day, Boccaccio, the new learning is speeding its way over the land, and influencing all the currents of society. To read of schisms and councils without reference to the evolution of the "Renaissance," is to read of schisms and councils, but not to learn history.

In Germany and France the "Renaissance" has of late been a favorite subject of study. Almost every side of it, literary and artistic, has been described, discussed, illustrated. The English "larger public," whose hunger for knowledge is not satisfied with the lean books of Mr. Roscoe on Lorenzo the "Magnificent" and Leo X., have for some years found a refecation of more substance, and certainly more pungent flavor, in Mr. Symonds' volumes. The greater part of the work thus far done, if not designed wholly on the lines laid down by Burckhardt, has at least been largely influenced by his notions and his spirit. And with all Burckhardt's diligence, originality, quick observation, and apt appreciation, he has had the misfortune, not uncommon, of choosing a point of view from which he could not possibly take in the whole course of the winding, circling streams of the "Renaissance." The elevation that satisfied him was much too low down. Pastor, surveying the scene from a higher range, gives a broad, free sketch of the "Renaissance," suggesting detail on every hand, and distributing the lights and shadows truthfully, quite regardless of mere picturesque effect.

In the "History of the German People" Janssen traced the double current[†] visible in the stream of humanism as it flowed through the field of German civilization. Pastor follows these two currents—one Pagan, one Christian—to the very fountain-head of the stream in Italy. When the Church came into being she lost no time and spared no labor in the effort to purify the turbid waters of Pagan learning. The works of the early fathers show how large a measure of success the Church attained, and time bears witness to her generosity, her sacrifices, her intelligence in utilizing, distributing, preserving the purer sources of ancient thought and imagination. Holding her divine mission well in view, the Church sought to instruct mankind in the right use of Pagan art and literature, as intellectual aids to the spread of the Gospel, of truth, and of Christian refinement; indeed, of morality and religion. Monachism was, from its foundation, the source of an ever-living, ever-acting renaissance.

The revival of classical studies coincides with the "Babylonian Captivity," the Great Schism, the consequent weakening of the Papal authority—and therefore of Christianity. It was a time of

great political disturbance. All the forces of absolutism were arrayed against the Papacy, hoping through its necessities or its fall to acquire an unrestrained mastery over men's consciences and bodies. Clergy and people fell into the clutches of heresiarchs, the bonds of morality were loosened, Christian ideals were temporarily lost sight of. Among the lovers of the new learning there arose a sect that accepted Pagan philosophy, poetry, rhetoric, not as handmaidens of Christianity, but as goddesses in a new pantheon. Valla set up Pleasure instead of Christ, and naked Vice instead of Christian virtue. Becadelli, Poggio, Filelfo, were proud of rivalling Ovid or Catullus in obscenity. Fate, Fortune, were the gods of men like Salutato, Marsigli, Marsuppini. Paganism was revived in a Christian land. Christianity was mocked, its doctrines reviled, its servants abused and libelled. Men busied themselves with composing Ciceronian diatribes against monks and nuns, and elegantly filthy protests against vows and virginity. We are living witnesses of the speedy work of filth in defiling, and can readily estimate the effect of the naturalist school of the 15th century on the public morals.

However, the historian of the "Renaissance," whether Protestant, Catholic, or infidel, owing to a mistaken sense of art, or to imperfect knowledge, or prejudice, or to an *a priori* view of history in general, based on the unscientific theories of the powerful, "short-sighted" school, has, traditionally, given undue prominence to the classically immoral, the pagan, the revolutionary aspects of the 15th century. The "classical" Christian, the virtuous, the holy features of the age have been kept in the background. There are ten men who can write dramatically of crime to the one whose art is pure enough, simple enough, to move men with the divine comedy of virtue. Does this, in part, explain the general tone of all our literature? Whatever be the answer to this question, it is with a sense of gratitude that we follow Pastor as he re-arranges persons and events in right relation, and does justice to the goodness as well as to the evil of the "Renaissance."

Petrarch, and even Boccaccio, enthusiastic lovers and forwarders of the new learning, were, at heart, firm Christians, and saw with regret the dangerous road their disciples were pursuing. Manetti, one of the most learned men of his day, the first Italian humanist to take up the study of the oriental languages, a philosopher and, though a layman, a theologian, was a model of every virtue, and a bold defender of the Church. Traversari, the monk, gathered the learned world of Florence, laymen and clerics, in the monastery of Santa Maria degli Angeli, to study Greek and Latin, philosophy, theology and literature, and busied himself with gathering rare manuscripts, and copying and translating them. Like his teacher,

Manetti, he was ever encouraging others by speech and writing to love learning. Bruni, whose dead body he crowned with the laurel, was, like Corraro and Barbaro, devoted to Christian as well as pagan learning, and used both for the honor of God and the moral well-being of men. Vegio, moved by the eloquence and the sweetness of St. Augustine's "Confessions," gave his life to the study of sacred and profane literature, and in his works on education showed how the one should be fused with the other in forming the perfect Christian scholar. Vittorino da Feltre, that ideal of a pedagogue with a mission, whose school was a pilgrimage house for students from France, Germany, and the Netherlands, as well as from every part of Italy, inspired men with a love for the "humanities" vivified by the love of God; and taught his lesson not from book alone, but by a wonderful example.

The false ways into which many were seeking to turn the new learning were apparent to thoughtful men. The prudent called attention to the dangers ahead, and sought to protect society against them by the spread of right principles. Unfortunately the hot-headed, the hasty, were as irrational in their methods as were the "poets" themselves. A cry went up against all Pagan learning. The Church, the Popes, gave no heed to this senseless cry. Clement of Alexandria, more than a thousand years before, had answered all such silly protestants. From Petrarch's day, through all the trials of the Church and the Papacy, Churchmen and Popes encouraged the new learning, fostered all the arts, patronized, supported, and honored the humanists. To use the wisdom of the ancients—"a gift from God"—to serve God's purposes, is a tradition as old as the Church. Pastor's suggestive sketch of the noble and ignoble tendencies of the early "Renaissance," is supplemented by a valuable page on the education and dutiful devotion of the monks, as evidenced by the rich remains of pulpit oratory that have come down to us, and the long list of preachers famed in the 15th century. And the splendidly wicked character of the time is rightly balanced by a record of its still more splendid holiness. Fifty men and women of the century have been honored by the Church with the title of Saint or Blessed. The world is busy to-day canonizing the unholy in history. Have the rationalists, the naturalists, the agnostics, been able to find fifty atrociously impious humanists of the 15th century worthy of a modern anti-clerical statue? Even so, they will be no less indebted than we are to Pastor's "Introduction," which points the way to a rational treatment of the history of Italian humanism.

Having traced the early development of the new learning, Pastor casts a glance at the history of the Popes from the beginning of the exile at Avignon to the end of the Great Schism. This part

of his work the author subdivides under three headings: "The Popes at Avignon, 1305-1376"; "The Schism and the great heretical movements, 1378-1409"; and "The Synods of Pisa and Constance, 1409-1417." Here Pastor enters upon ground already covered by Creighton; but Pastor's purpose and method are not at all Creighton's. Indeed, a comparison of the latter's thin, pale drawing, with Pastor's solid, learned sketch, would be unfair to the English historian.

From the beginning the Church has been engaged in a contest for the liberty of the Church, and that is to say for the freedom of mankind. Applying in a larger sense the admirable words of Mr. Lilly concerning Gregory: the one aim of the Popes has been to free the Church "from the fetters, whether of vice or of earthly tyranny, to vindicate her claims to absolute independence in carrying out her mission, as a society perfect and complete in herself, divine in her constitution, divine in her superiority to the limits of time and space, in the world but not of it, a supernatural order amid the varying forms of secular polity." The natural defects, the human weaknesses, the sins, the crimes, if you will, of individual Popes have not swerved the Church from her heaven-appointed mission. The long struggle with the German emperors tested to their utmost the aims, the courage, and the talents of a line of Popes that fought for and maintained the rights of the Church against all the odds of human power and inhuman device. For notwithstanding the glowing pages that tell of the wondrous, the extravagant power of the Papacy during the Middle Ages—a power that the "popular" historian imagines to have been created out of nothing, then seized upon by itself, and finally established by means of forged "donations" and "decretals," and the unholy use of force and threats—the facts show that the Popes of the time were, as far as temporalities were concerned, nominal rulers. Exiles, the sport of emperors, kings, robber soldiers and mobs, the story of their wanderings and their bitter trials cannot but move the most hardened reader's sympathies. Kings and emperors, greedy for unrestrained power, ambitious to be Popes, persecuted, threatened, defied, attacked Pope after Pope. When the Hohenstaufens went down before the righteous hand of God, liberty in the presence of the Popes breathed freely; but her wounds were deeper than she knew. In the long struggle with the emperors, the Popes had been forced again and again to seek refuge in France. Ambition and greed were at work there, and sought pay in ecclesiastical power and honor, in church property and church money. Then came the larger ambition, the imperial ambition to control the Papacy itself. Forced to lean on France, the Church naturally fell under French

influence, and though Boniface VIII. declared that "he had rather be a dog than a Frenchman," within two years after his death Bernard d'Agout, as Clement V., ascended the Papal throne (1305), and for the following seventy-three years the Church was ruled by Frenchmen. The period of the "Captivity of Babylon" was one fruitful with evil for the future of Christianity; and the seven French Popes that reigned at Avignon are judged to day quite as severely as they were by the Italians and Germans of the 14th century. It is a question whether they deserve all the blame that has been lavished on them. The French and the Germans are seemingly agreed that their forefathers, whether Popes, kings or emperors, are fairly chargeable with a large share of the ills which the Church has suffered in the past. Whether the historians of either nationality have succeeded in justly apportioning the exact share of responsibility that is chargeable to the other side of the house, is somewhat doubtful. Probably an American, a true cosmopolitan, will eventually settle the matter. It is an advantage, sometimes, not to be too deeply rooted in the past.

Whatever the faults of policy, or of government, of the French Popes, they were all, as Dr. Pastor shows, respectable in intellect, and, considering the times and the difficulties of their position, fairly good rulers. Benedict XII., Clement VI., Innocent VI., Urban V., Gregory XI., in a senate of the world's governors, would have no cause to hide their heads. Reviewing Pastor's "History" in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* (January, 1887), M. Godefroy Kurth calls attention to the unwonted justice done these Popes by the learned German author. Their ceaseless activity in the work of spreading the Gospel among heathen nations has not hitherto received due recognition. The first of the Avignon Popes, Clement V., and his successor, John XXII., designed a noble plan of missions in India, China, Egypt, Nubia, Abyssinia, Barbary and Morocco. The later French Popes were active in cultivating the good seed so generously sown by their predecessors, and the large hearted Clement VI., the staunch protector of the persecuted Jews, has left a record of his intention to carry the missions to the most Eastern limits of Asia. As Pastor says, neither the history of these great foundations, nor indeed of the French Popes, can be fully written until their *Regesta* have been published. This important work is now being done under the fostering care of Leo XIII. In time, Mr. Creighton or his continuator will be better able to judge the value of the influence of the views of Marsiglio of Padua, and of Occam, upon the world, when these views can be fully compared with the apostolic ideas of the Avignonese Popes.

To form a just judgment on this period and on the development

of later centuries, we must have before our eyes a clear, full view of the social conditions of the time. Dr. Pastor has given us such a view. Towards the end of the 13th century there was a general improvement in trade throughout Italy, the Netherlands, France and Germany. With good times came luxury, extravagance, loose living and a love of pleasure, confined to no single class. The clergy did not escape the contagion. It invaded the Papal court. Politicians cried out for the reform of the Church. The Popes and the clergy are always the Church when the man with a beam in his eye sees the monstrous mote in the eye of authority. There were no greater enemies of reform, when there was question of reform, than the temporal rulers. A vast number of the clergy were their creatures; and reform would have compelled them to be true churchmen or would have ousted them. Reform at such a price was too costly. But, against all the odds, Benedict XII. was a reformer; Innocent VI. cleaned out his corrupt court and announced as his rule of action "that Church honors must be the reward of virtue and not of birth." Urban V. was a radical reformer, who made his father give up a pension he received from the King of France. Simony was a vice of the day, but it was an old vice. If "the traffic in livings was conducted as openly and unblushingly throughout Europe as it is conducted in England to-day,"¹ it is not more surprising to find the *curia* buying and selling than to see an emperor auctioning to the highest bidder the benefices he had either seized or acquired under threats or as a peace offering. The age was greedy and luxurious. Pastor says—the judgment is, perhaps, severe—that the moral condition of society was lower than it had been at any period since the tenth century. It is well to remember that during the "Babylonian captivity" there were other men alive besides the French Popes. To explain the action of all the forces of the world by the defects of one is easy, but such an explanation satisfies only the "near-sighted" men.

At the first conclave held in Rome for 75 years, the Italians recovered the Papacy and the rash Urban VI. entered on his career of passionate, imprudent, well-meant reform. Within a few months the French Cardinals had set up Robert of Geneva as an anti-Pope, and the sad period of schism opened. The effect of this fatal move in disorganizing the Church everywhere, in fixing and increasing the evils already so marked among clergy and people, the impetus it gave to shameful heresies, to the spread of communistic and revolutionary ideas, to doubt, division and contempt for the whole hierarchy, are so clearly and effectively brought out in Pastor's following chapters that the reader cannot fail to get a larger grasp of the world and the Popes at the beginning of the 15th century.

¹ *Chapters in European History*, W. S. Lilly, p. 127.

Consciences were disturbed, holy men and women supported the anti-Popes, the kings and the princes cunningly played, now with Pope, now with anti-Pope. Through the necessities of its position the Papacy, which had so long fought for freedom, became entangled with the civil power. Quick to take advantage of these necessities, civil rulers usurped ecclesiastical rights and put forward new claims. There were not wanting canonists to defend the royal or imperial encroachments. Frequent attempts at compromise between Popes and pretenders were foiled by political chicanery. To have a Pope of one's own was most convenient. Indeed, the civil rulers were more Popes than the real or pseudo-Popes.

Meantime, the true reformers were not idle. Noble men like Groot and Radewin went down among the people, educating them and awakening them to better lives. Innocent VII. fostered the arts and sciences he so much loved, and, with all his troubles, revived Boniface VIII.'s plan for a Roman university. The humanists, Christian and Pagan, were gathered into the Papal court. Their talents and acquirements made them serviceable, but they were treacherous servants, often, and used their knowledge and the experience gained in the Papal offices to injure the patrons that gave them bread.

At length, under Gregory XII., there was a new movement for union. When Gregory halts there are appeals to a future Pope, to a better informed Pope, to a universal Council, to Jesus Christ himself. Finally, we have the synods of Pisa and Constance. Mr. Creighton's first volume is taken up, principally, with the details of the conciliar movement and of the doings at Pisa and Constance. After reading Dr. Pastor's *résumé*, the student may fill up the picture with varied detail out of Mr. Creighton's interesting book. The Pisans declared that both Gregory and the anti-Pope, Benedict XIII., were heretics, and "removed" them. Then the brave Cardinals made a third Pope, Alexander V., in the interest of union. After the death of Alexander V. came John XXIII., "more of a warrior than a churchman." At length Pope and anti-Popes agreed with the Emperor Sigismund to submit their claims to a general Council to be called at Constance. John XXIII. was deposed; Gregory resigned and was appointed Cardinal Bishop of Porto; and Benedict XIII. fled to the mountain fortress of Peñíscola. "I have not understood the world and the world has not understood me," were the last words of Gregory, who died in 1417, two years after his resignation. As we read Pastor's instructive analysis of the world of Gregory's day, we sympathize with him. Who could understand such a world?

If the power of the Papacy was ever endangered, if it at any time

seemed to be "tottering to its fall," to use Mr. Ranke's hackneyed prophesy, it was in 1417, when Martin V. put on the tiara. The Council of Constance had claimed to be superior to the Pope—a revolutionary proceeding. The Papal See was vacant, and so remained for two years; the Council ruling the Church. Huss, convicted of heresy, had been burned at the stake (1415), but schism and heresy were more rampant than ever in Bohemia. The laity and the lower clergy were loud in their attacks on the upper clergy; monks and priests were preaching revolution in the town of Constance itself; morals had not improved; reform seemed as impossible as ever. As far as the Church and the Papacy were concerned, the greatest danger lay in the attack that had been made, from within, on the Constitution.

There is always a crowd of good people in the world who love peace at any price. They were satisfied, happy. But the schism was not at an end, nor did it disappear until the resignation of the anti-Pope, Clement VIII., in 1429. Of the reign of Martin V. (1417–1431), who, by his skill, persistence, and courage at length closed the schism, Dr. Pastor gives a comprehensive study. Writers of primers, of handbooks, of biographies, and indeed of history, will find in the life of this Pope, as well as in that of Eugenius IV., Nicholas V., and Calixtus III., a wealth of material closely compacted, and affording the most valuable indications for the study of the political, social, intellectual, and religious movements during a half-century of extraordinary activity. The character of each of these Popes is pictured from all sides; the individuality of the great churchmen, who operated in every field, is realistically portrayed; the growth, the rise and fall of old and new opinions, are closely traced. Again we feel the power of the scientific method of the school of Böhmer and Janssen, and the vast uses of noble "drudgery."

In the light of recent events in Italy we are tempted to suggest that a "cheap edition" of a work giving a sketch of Rome *without* the Popes, could not but serve a patriotic purpose. During the "Babylonian captivity" the great city became a ruin and a den of robbers. Christian and Pagan monuments were neglected and destroyed. The churches were roofless. In the Lateran, as well as in St. Peter's, the cattle grazed. When Urban V. returned to Rome, his first care was to repair the buildings and churches, and to improve the material condition of the capital of Christendom. The Romans, the Italians, have always viewed the Papacy with the eyes of the emperors and the kings as an instrument of a mighty power which they longed to control, and as a treasury whose funds they were greedy to appropriate. No sooner had the Popes housed them decently, put coin into their purses, and pushed them

onward in the way of the highest human civilization, than they assumed the airs of beggars on horseback. To leave them to themselves was to turn them into a mob of poets and orators, shouting abuse, howling defiance, but, more than all, whining about the unity of Christendom, the wounds of the Church, the sanctity of the Apostles, and begging that the power that made them, and without which they were a by-word among the nations, should speedily submit to their cultured barbarism and crack-brained arrogance.

The schism brought misery and ruin upon Rome, which, at the election of Martin V., "had not even the form of a city." So abject was the poverty of the people that on the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, 1414, they could not provide lights for the illumination of the "Confession" of the princes of the Apostles. Hardly a Pagan monument was standing. Hadrian's tomb was in ruins, the houses were barely habitable, the churches were stables—we can trace *thus* Italian tradition very far back. The city walls had tumbled down. Wolves paraded the streets and played the rôle of resurrectionists in the graveyards. Martin outran the "Renaissance," renewing streets, houses, churches, the Vatican, St. Peter's, St. John Lateran. To Rome he led Gentile da Fabriano, Pisanello, Masaccio, masters all, to beautify the churches, and to enkindle in the unlovely Roman citizen a love for great art and religion. The arts of the goldsmith, the jeweller, the die-cutter, the decorator, were warmed into new life under the sun of the Papacy. Within a few years Eugenius IV. was driven from the city. When, in 1443, he returned after an exile of ten years, he found the streets were highways, where the cows, sheep, goats, leisurely browsed. Historic monuments had been passed through the lime-kiln, precious marbles had been stolen from the churches, houses and churches were unclean, unrepaired, the wolves were as nonchalant as ever, and the blatant Roman discussed grave political questions in classic rags and tatters. Eugenius initiated a new renaissance. Houses and churches were again set in order, the Pantheon was "restored," Ghiberti and Filarete were freely encouraged to immortalize themselves in gold, and jewel, and bronze, and blest Angelico was called to lift the world to heaven.

But it was under Nicholas V., who would, if he could, "have given all his means for books and buildings," that Rome became, indeed, the centre of Christendom. Such was the deliberate aim of this great Pope—to make Rome the centre of religion and of all the arts; to set up there enduring witnesses of the might of God, so that men might be strengthened in faith and seek high things. Nicholas knew the worth of the Papacy to the world. He recognized that the one great need of the world was that the Popes

should be independent of the rabble of kings and mobs; that the Popes should be the owners of a home that they could defend against all comers. Then would they raise the world, whether it willed or not, to heights it did not dream of. Nicholas spoke the words—more still, he did the deeds—that make Rome what it is, and entitle it to-day to be what it is not—to the shame of all Christians be it said—the city of the Popes, as it is, even now, the source of the one true Christianity.

Pastor's summary of the mighty doings of the "Founder of the Papal 'Mäcenats,'" is certainly the most complete that has thus far seen the light. Artists, literary men, patrons, students of the "Renaissance," of general history, or of the Papacy, will here gather new knowledge, new views, and, perhaps, new ambitions.

Mr. Creighton's first two volumes cover this period; in fact they close only with the reign of Pius II. Pastor's first volume ends with the death of Calixtus III., the predecessor of Pius. Comparing the two works—not to refer again to the radical differences between Pastor's method and Creighton's, between the breadth and learning of the former and the restricted and not too learned handling of the latter—the reader cannot fail to be impressed with the apt remark of Mr. Lilly on Dean Milman's interesting book: "How difficult it is for a Protestant clergyman, however scholarly and accomplished, really to enter into the spirit of an age dominated by religious conceptions so radically opposed, in some important respects, to those of which he is a professed exponent."¹ This difficulty is a hindrance to a true judgment on Catholic conceptions in the 15th, or in the 19th, as in the 11th century; and a stumbling-block not only in the way of Protestant clergymen, but of non-Catholics in general. Friedrich Nippold, that staunch Evangelical, has stated the case boldly and justly in his "*Geschichte des Katholicismus seit der Restauration von 1814.*" Discussing Bismarck's "Kulturkampf" and its fiasco, Nippold charges it "especially to the general ignorance of Catholic things among diplomats." Lord Acton, in a learned, suggestive review of Mr. Lea's "*History of the Inquisition*," seems to imply that this defect is noticeable even among Americans who are neither clergymen nor diplomats. The ability to enter into the spirit of Catholic conceptions is particularly required in order to appreciate the action of the four Popes, whose history Pastor is writing, towards contemporary synods, heresies, and things spiritual in general. The trials, the successes, the failures of the Papacy did not abate its claims to spiritual power and independence, whether of councils, universities, chancellors, or potentates; claims which the Popes definitely established in this 19th century when their temporal

¹ *Chapters in European History*, p. 152.

power is almost as much of a shadow as it was, at times, in the 15th century.

Dr. Pastor has gathered most full and interesting material illustrating the character and the doings of the great literary men of the age: Ænea Silvio, Alberti, Tortello, Maffei, Biondio, and the whole group of humanists; and of the great Cardinals, Capranica, Cesarini, Albergati, Correr, Castiglione, Orsini, Vitelleschi, Scarampo, Bessarion, Carvajal, Torquemada, De Allosio, Cusa—to name but a few of the active, learned, intellectual, and spirited men that then honored the ever illustrious senate of the Church. Janssen has done justice to the learning and activity of Cusa. The reader who is innocent of the work of real reform done before that ardent, sweet-lipped, ascetic “reformer,” Martin Luther, was vouchsafed to an expectant world, will read with amazement of Cusa’s far-reaching reforms in the empire.

“Turkey, that curse of Christendom,” says Bishop Stubbs, “means nothing, represents nothing, but butchery, barbarism and the vilest slavery.” Had the Popes been able they would have saved Christendom from this “curse”; from “butchery, barbarism and the vilest slavery.” But the rulers of the West were too much occupied in fastening absolutism upon so-called nationalities. They have not yet finished the work. The Popes saw the danger from the first, and lavished money, appeals, spiritual gifts, in the vain effort to awaken the men of Europe and the eunuchs of Constantinople to the fate that threatened both East and West. Pastor’s pages testify to the foresight, the love of mankind, the energy, displayed by the homeless Popes in the effort to save our Christian civilization; and no less do they evidence the narrowness, the cowardice, of Greek and Latin. In his chapter on the “Fall of Constantinople” and in the history of Calixtus, Dr. Pastor details the ceaseless, self-sacrificing efforts of the latter and of Nicholas V. to undo what had been done, or at least to bar the further progress of the brutal Mahometan. The Greeks “had rather see the Turkish turban in the city than Rome’s tiara.” They see it there to-day. And what of the Western world, that later echoed the sentiment of Grand-duke Lucas? Disunited, torn by social, revolutionary, un-Christian ideas, it is forced to keep the “sick man” alive and to glory in the splendid “liberty” it enjoys under the splendid weight of 28,000,000 soldiers “at a total annual public cost of \$600,000,000,” and to look appealingly towards the “prisoner in the Vatican” to save it from the inevitable. Had the people been free in the 14th and 15th centuries the Turk would have been driven back. The Popes and the people are ever at one where freedom exists. Calixtus manned fleets, preached crusades, sold precious jewels, but France, England, Germany,

Naples—all, all were blind and tricky. Christian of Denmark stole from the cathedral the money gathered for the campaign against the Turks. Hunniades and Capistran were left to fight unsupported and to die in the face of the foe. When Europe failed him, the strong-hearted Calixtus appealed to Ethiopians, Syrians, Georgians, Persians, Turcomans, but he did not shame the pettifoggers who were busy debating the comparative value of the decrees of Constance and Basel. With the Pope's aid Scanderbeg, the "athlete of Christ," saved Albania; the Pope's fleet was victorious at Metelino, and Calixtus died hoping that his successor might be able to annihilate "the enemy of the Faith."

"There is hardly any other department," wrote Böhmer, "in which the spirit of irreligion and of opposition to the Church has done greater injustice and caused greater mischief than in that of history writing." To correct injustices, to undo evil, is worthy work. Truth corrects the one, undoes the other. History, like this of Pastor's, written in her interest, deserves the approbation of all loyal servants of truth. Echoing the words of Pertz, Leo XIII. has said in substance that a full knowledge of the acts of the Popes would prove their best defence. The facts presented by Pastor justify the saying. "It would certainly be displeasing to the Popes to maintain that they never were in the least to blame. We owe them only truth, and they require no more." So wrote De Maistre, and he put the case fairly. Pastor not only states the facts that are blamable, or that seem to be blamable; he also judges the facts, forming his judgment on the Popes, possibly with a stricter application of right principles than if he were not what he is, a Catholic. For the Catholic, having, through his acquaintance with the spirit of the Church, a higher ideal of the Papal office than it is possible for a non-Catholic to have, is apt, unwittingly, to measure the Popes by this ideal, however he may seek to apply to them only what the requirements of history demand. What these requirements are has been well stated by the learned historian, Maurenbrecher, in an article on the "Objectivity of the Historian," in the "*Historisches Taschenbuch*."¹ "It is, indeed, the historian's task to subject to his comparative criticism the moral atmosphere of the different centuries and of the different generations of men; but he should weigh and measure the individual man only in relation to his contemporaries, and only according to the moral notions and customs of his time." It will be difficult to find a Pope who was not an "individual man," and if no Pope be measured by a harsher rule than Maurenbrecher's, the most blamable will hold a very fair "comparative" place in history.

¹ Leipzig, 1882, p. 341.

With pleasure we learn, on good authority,¹ that the venerable Cardinal Newman has taken a lively interest in the learned and conscientious work of Dr. Pastor, and that arrangements have been made for the publication of an English translation of the first volume during the coming year. No scholar will hereafter venture to write or speak on the history of the Popes without a full acquaintance with this model work—a work that does honor not only to the writer, but to German Catholic learning. Nor will the general reader find the history less useful or less interesting. Written in a simple, agreeable style, neither its detail nor its array of authorities hinders it from being “popular” in the good sense of the word.

Dr. Pastor, who is “extraordinary” professor of history at the University of Innsbruck, had already made a name for himself through the “History of the Church movements for Reunion, during the reign of Charles V.,” published in 1880. The promise he gave there is more than fulfilled in the present work, which, according to his design, will be completed only with the sixth volume. Between Janssen and Pastor we shall soon be in possession of material affording a larger insight than was heretofore possible into the development of the revolutionary movement in which the German “reformation” was merely a step. As Pastor’s plan seems to have confined him more especially to a history of the Popes in their relations with Italy, the empire, and France, there is still room for a scientific history of their relations with England, Ireland and Scotland. No doubt we shall, before long, have such a history. Its need is apparent; and, in England, there is a little group of Catholic historians that gives promise of greater things in the near future. Soon we shall see an active critical school doing for English history what German, French and Italian Catholics are doing for the history of their respective countries.

When may we hope to see a learned school of Catholic-American historians doing its share of hard work in the cause of truth? Just now the willing student has every reason to be discouraged. Outside of the colleges there are few societies of learning. Catholic and public libraries are woefully deficient in the books without which no serious work can be done; and there is no word of a Mæcenas, and no sign of a Renaissance. If report speaks true, Dr. Ludwig Pastor is to occupy the chair of history in our new university. Should he come among us there can be no doubt that he will try to excite a genuine interest in sound historical studies, and that he will train a certain number of our young men in thorough

¹ *Literarischer Handweiser* (No. 468-469), 1888. The first volume of Pastor’s history has been translated into French by Furcy Raynaud, Plon., Paris, 1888, 2 vols., 8vo.

methods. In order, however, that he may have the success he will deserve, and that we may fully benefit by the advantages his presence will bring us, the spirit of earnestness that fills our brethren across the sea must be wooed to our side of the water, and encouraged when she honors us with her vivifying presence. Possibly the words recently addressed by M. Domet de Vorges to a French public are not inapplicable here: "The last generation of Catholics has lived too much within the domestic circle; the new one must be turned towards larger ambitions."

ABELARD.

THE amatory phase of the life of Abelard has been so frequently the theme of poets and others of that type, that a general and crude notion concerning it is widely spread. Only the student, however, is aware that the "woes of Abelard and Heloise" are by no means the chief things for him to consider in the career of this extraordinary man; and that if Abelard were celebrated merely for the events of which Pope and others have sung, that career would find no place among the topics noticed by the serious historian. But the errors which he taught from his professorial chair, and his peculiar relations with the great St. Bernard which thence ensued, are worthy of close attention. Bayle, Mosheim, and other Protestant authors have shown great sympathy with Abelard, not because this philosopher was a contumacious heretic, for we shall show that he was not such; but because they would detract from the reputation of "the last of the Fathers," St. Bernard, who was the ambitious professor's chief opponent. Before entering upon a narration of the aberrations of Abelard and of the course of St. Bernard, we must give a short sketch of the former's life, for the popular version is in many respects inaccurate.

Peter Abelard was born in 1079, at Palais, a village about eight miles east of Nantes, in Brittany. His father was a soldier, but fond of letters, and hence the young Abelard was made, not a knight, but a scholar. When a mere lad, he became a real peripatetic, going from place to place, and disputing, wherever he found an opportunity, on dialectics. Arriving at length in Paris, he attended the lectures of the celebrated William of Champeaux, archdeacon of that diocese, and one of the first philosophers of his

time. At first William was greatly pleased with his new auditor; but he was vexed when he found that many of his scholars deemed the young man more fit than himself to occupy the chair. Already, in fact, Abelard gave unmistakable signs of those qualities which were to prove the bane of his life. Not only his conduct, as we learn from his contemporaries, but his own writings show him to have been vain, presumptuous, and jealous. He disputed that he might enjoy the pleasure of conquest, rather than for the sake of truth. Nothing pleased him so much as to weaken the reputation of other professors, and thereby entice away their scholars. He was a handsome man, possessed a charming voice, and was both poet and philosopher. But his own works show that he owed his success to his seductive externals rather than to phenomenal solidity of doctrine. In his letters he complains bitterly of his many enemies and of their persecutions; but it is too evident that many of these enemies were deliberately made such by himself, that he might defy and conquer them. Abelard was only twenty-two years of age when he opened a scholastic hall at Melun. His reputation became immense; and as he combated the views of his old master, William of Champeaux, on certain scholastic questions, the lecture-room of that unfortunate professor was soon deserted for his own. After a while Abelard removed to Corbie; but hearing that William had resigned his chair in Paris, and had become a regular canon, he went to Mount St. Genevieve, and there began to lecture. After a few years he intermitted his lectures, and attended the theological course of Anselm of Laon,¹ a famous professor of divinity. Here he undertook to lecture in opposition to his professor; but his proceedings being interdicted, he returned to Paris, where he soon acquired great fame and much money. Here we will succinctly but accurately narrate the events which have excited so much sympathy for Abelard. Until his thirty-fifth year he seems to have led an ordinarily exemplary life; but his tremendous pride needed a rebuke, and it received a severe one. About the year 1114, Abelard formed the acquaintance of the canon Fulbert, a beneficiary of the cathedral of Paris; and through the canon he came to know the canon's niece, a beautiful young woman, renowned for learning. He soon fell a captive to the attractions of Heloise, and deliberately designed her seduction.

¹ This Anselm should not be confounded with *the* Anselm, namely, the saintly archbishop of Canterbury, one of the most learned men of the Middle Ages. This confusion is sometimes made; thus, in Appleton's *Condensed Cyclopædia* we are told that Abelard "studied divinity at Laon, under Anselm, whom he also eclipsed." As there were, at that period, only two Anselms of very great name, viz., the saints of Canterbury and of Lucca, this non-qualification of the name, and the glorifying of Abelard with the term "eclipse," would mislead the ordinary reader.

Knowing that Fulbert was proud of his niece's mental acquirements, Abelard offered to reside in their house, and besides paying for his board, to act as tutor to Heloise. The offer was accepted, and Abelard himself tells us, in delicate and eloquent terms, of the result of his plot, namely, that Heloise became a too willing victim to passion¹. In time, her condition compelled her to leave her uncle's house, and to betake herself into Brittany, to the care of a sister of Abelard. There she gave birth to a son, who was named Astrolabius. When Fulbert discovered the state of affairs, he naturally insisted that the parties should marry; Abelard was free to do so, for although a cleric, he was not in holy orders. Indeed, he would have married Heloise from the beginning; but he was ambitious of ecclesiastical preferment, and his overweening vanity led him to aspire to any height. If the alleged *Letters* of Heloise are genuine, and we shall show that they are probably spurious, she herself encouraged him in this conduct, preferring "to be his mistress rather than his wife," if she could only see him idolized by the multitude.² Be this as it may, Abelard now proposed marriage; but her answer shows that, learned though she was, passion had completely warped her mind, and that much of the sympathy extended to her has been misplaced. She told Abelard that it would be inglorious for him, whom nature had made for all women, to unite himself to one; that matrimony was full of vexations, and that Theophrastes and Cicero had declared that one man could not wed both a wife and philosophy; that "there was nothing common between scholars and servant-women, between cradles and writing-materials, between books and distaffs, between pens and spindles." In spite of these strange reasons Abelard persisted, and Heloise yielding, the marriage took place in Paris, the uncle consenting that it should be kept secret for the sake of the professor's ambition. But the foolish Fulbert, proud to have so great a philosopher for a nephew, soon boasted of his relationship; the servants also began to talk. Then Heloise denied that she was married, and finally Abelard persuaded her to quiet things by retiring for a time to a convent at Argenteuil, where she had been educated; she might don the nun's veil, but not take the vows. When this came to the ears of the canon and his kindred, they imagined that Abelard had tired of his wife, and had ridden himself of an encumbrance. Maddened at the fancied insult and burning for revenge, they attacked the professor and barbarously mutilated him. Shortly after his recovery, the humiliated Abelard, moved, as he himself testifies, more by shame than by devotion,

¹ *Letter to a Friend, on the History of my Misfortune.*

² *Epistle to Abelard*, No. 2.

took the monastic habit in the celebrated Benedictine abbey of St. Denis. Heloise became a nun at Argenteuil; and although in the letters which she *is said* to have afterward sent to Abelard, there are some expressions savoring of levity and even of a criminal hankering after the past, she seems to have finally settled into a contented and holy religious. In the course of time she became prioress of the convent at Argenteuil, and when the community was forced by the monks of St. Denis, who wished the house for themselves, to abandon Argenteuil, she took her nuns to the oratory of the Paraclete, which Abelard and his pupils, as we shall see, had constructed with their own hands, and afterward ceded to Heloise. While abbess of the Paraclete, Heloise was visited by St. Bernard. The Blessed Peter Mauritius, abbot of Cluny, greatly esteemed her; and in one of his letters he congratulates her as "a woman truly and entirely philosophical, who had chosen the Gospel instead of logic, the Apostle instead of physics, and the cloister instead of the Academy."

Had Abelard become a monk simply for love of quiet, although that would have been a merely human motive, and therefore unworthy, he might not have been totally disappointed. But having done so in pure disgust and shame, without any supernatural impulse whatever, it is not surprising that for many years his life knew but little of peace. Again, he seems to have brought into the monastery all the worldly spirit which had ever actuated him; his terrible experience had not lessened his pride of intellect, and when contradictions came, he knew not how to bear them. When Abelard first entered the monastery of St. Denis, his shame led him to remain withdrawn from the gaze of the world, but his reputation caused many demands to be made on his superiors for a resumption of his lectures. The abbot Adam soon gave the order, and once again multitudes of students were entranced by the oracles of their idol. But in the year 1121, the great master was accused of heresy before the Synod of Soissons; a book he had written on *The Trinity* was condemned because of errors on the omnipotence of God, and he was ordered himself to give it to the flames. He was consigned to the custody of the abbot of St. Medard at Soissons, but the Papal legate, Conon of Palestrina, released him and sent him back to St. Denis. Soon after this he became involved in trouble with the abbot Adam, owing to his opinion that the holy Areopagite was not the first bishop of Paris. By this he touched the monks of St. Denis on a tender spot, and so furiously did they resent his theory that they excited against him the ire of King Louis VI., telling the monarch that the honor of St. Denis was the honor of France; and it would have gone hard with the daring master had not Stephen, the royal steward, obtained for him the

privilege of leaving his monastery.¹ He sought the protection of Theobald, count of Troyes, and having obtained permission from his abbot, he constructed, in a beautiful solitude given to him by some admirers, a little oratory of reeds for a residence. His former pupils learning of this change, they came from all quarters to dwell around him and listen to his lectures, building, in the intervals of study, huts for habitations, and living as they best could, until the completion of a larger oratory which would contain the hundreds of scholars drawn thither by almost insane admiration of Abelard. When finished, this oratory was dedicated to the Holy Trinity, and as the professor had found much consolation herein, he called it the Paraclete. After a residence of a few years in this retreat, Abelard was chosen abbot by the monks of St. Gildas de Ruys, in Brittany; and as by this time he had advanced much in piety, he became very zealous in the enforcement of discipline. The consequence was that some of his monks several times attempted his life. After his condemnation in 1140 by the Synod of Sens, of which we shall soon speak, Abelard appealed to Pope Innocent II., and in the meantime accepted the hospitality of the venerable Peter, abbot of Cluny. For two years he edified that strict community by the manifestation of every monastic virtue. We shall have occasion to cite the letter sent by the abbot of Cluny to Innocent II. in favor of Abelard, but we here give a portion of the one in which Peter informed the abbess Heloise of "the master's" truly holy death: "I do not recollect of ever having seen his equal in humility; Germanus would not appear to the accurate observer more abject, or Martin poorer. When I forced him to occupy a superior position among our large number of brethren, he acted as though he were the last of all. I was frequently astonished while watching him in the processions, walking with the others before me, as I reflected how such a man condemned himself. And while there are some religious who desire

¹ The indignation of the monks of St. Denis was not unnatural, for one of their greatest glories was in the presumed fact that *their* St. Denis was the holy Areopagite. That the first bishop of Paris was *a* St. Denis seems to be certain, but the ancient and once almost universally received opinion that he was the Areopagite is now rejected by the best critics, most solid arguments being adduced to show that he flourished in the third, not in the first, century. From Hilduin in the ninth century down to Alexandre in the eighteenth, all who hold that the Areopagite was the first bishop of Paris base their theory on the tradition that Pope St. Clement sent a certain Denis to Gaul, and they conclude that this personage must have been the Areopagite simply because the philosopher was still living during the pontificate of Clement. But none of the ancient writers say that the Areopagite was made bishop of Paris, or even went into Gaul. On the contrary, the old Martyrologies make an explicit distinction between the saint of Athens and him of Paris; and the Roman Archives, whenever they cite the words of the Areopagite, always designate him as bishop of Athens, never of Paris, as they would do if he had been transferred to the latter see.

sumptuous clothing, he was careless in such matters, being content with simple garments of any kind. He followed the same system in his food, in his drink, and in every care of his body ; condemning, in himself and in others, both by word and in practice, not only luxuries, but everything not absolutely necessary. His study was constant, his prayer frequent ; his silence continual, unless when a conference of the monks, or a sermon to them, compelled him to speak. Often he approached the heavenly Sacraments, and as often as he was able he offered to God the Sacrifice of the Lamb. . . . His mind, tongue, and actions were ever occupied in divine things, or on philosophy, or on matters of erudition. . . . As he was troubled by an itch and other bodily ailments, I sent him to the mild climate of Chalons, and there, so far as his complaints permitted, he renewed his olden studies, and was ever at his books. As we read of the great Gregory, he allowed no moment to go unoccupied by prayer, or by reading, or by writing, or by dictation. The coming of the gospel visitor found him among these holy exercises. How holily, how like a Catholic, he made his Confession of Faith and then of his sins ; how eagerly he received the Viaticum for his journey and the pledge of eternal life, the Body of our Redeemer ; how confidently he committed his body and soul to Him, can be attested by all the religious of that monastery." With this consoling and edifying letter the venerable Peter of Cluny sent the remains of Abelard to Heloise, and she interred them in her convent of the Paraclete. This letter of the holy abbot is sufficient testimony to the repentance and holy end of Abelard, but the reader will doubtless find interest in the following, the first of two epitaphs which the venerable Peter sent to be engraved on the tomb of his friend : " Abelard was the Socrates of France, the Plato of the West, our Aristotle ; equal, if not superior, to all the logicians who have ever lived ; known throughout the world as the prince of learning ; of genius varied, subtle, and acute ; mastering all men by strength of reason and by artistic diction. But he triumphed the most when he became a professed monk of Cluny, and cultivated the true philosophy of Christ. Here he happily completed the days of a long life, leaving us the hope that now he is numbered among true philosophers."

There is much sickening sentimentality abroad in connection with the names of Abelard and Heloise ; thousands, who know absolutely nothing of the consummate theologian and philosopher, sympathize with the unfortunate lover. Even certain serious historians play the school-girl, and manifest symptoms of hysteria when they touch on the " woes of Abelard and Heloise." Listen to the grave Henri Martin declaiming how Heloise offers to the world an example of real love, " of an entire surrender of one's

self"; insisting that the importance of Heloise "in the moral history of humanity" is not due to her extraordinary learning; telling us how, when immured in a nunnery, respected by the entire Church, she "does not change interiorly," does not undergo the mystic death of the cloister, never repents of her love, accepts not monastic asceticism, but "eternally" protests in her heart which (nevertheless!) is "so well formed for divine love"; declaring that this same unrepentant Heloise, "inconsolable and unsubmitting," appears like "a great veiled figure" at the entrance of "the moral world"; and finally congratulating "the just instinct" of those Frenchmen who have made of her "one of the national glories," because she is "the great saint of love." Such ravings may suit the "Druidic school" of which Henri Martin was the head, but they should not be encouraged by a Christian. And whence this deluge of tears? Whether shed by Colardeau, Mercier, Saurin, Pope, or Martin, they are caused by the "immortal" letters of Heloise—letters which the last-named author regards as "bearing the characteristics of no epoch," but as "above all time"; as revealing "no accidental form of the soul," but its very "eternal depth." And yet, remarks a modern critic,¹ it would seem that these letters were no more genuine than those of Penelope to Ulysses, of Phœdra to Hippolytus, of Briseis to Achilles, of Sappho to Phaon, of Helen to Paris, which Ovid has transmitted to us. This prosaic truth has been well evinced by M. Lalanne,² from whose essay we extract the following arguments: The alleged letters of Heloise, so redolent of passion, contain many contradictions and impossibilities, and their tone is inexplicable. One can conceive how Heloise could have said such things to Abelard during the first years following their separation; but fourteen years of religious life had elapsed before the first letter was written. And here she speaks to a man fifty-four years old, exhausted by study, a wandering life, and persecution, and who now aspires only to eternal repose. Nothing checks her vehemence, and yet she is the woman of whom, shortly before, Abelard had said³ that "the entire world admired her piety, wisdom, and inconceivable sweetness of patience in all circumstances; she seldom left her cell, devoting herself therein to holy meditation and prayer." And even if we admit, which it is very difficult to do, that from the day of the catastrophe to the moment when, expelled from Argenteuil, she and her nuns were welcomed by Abelard to the Paraclete, Heloise never met him, it is nevertheless certain that on this occasion she

¹ *History of France*, vol. iii., p. 315, edit. 1855.

² Larroque, *Errors of M. Martin*, published in the *Annals of Christian Philosophy*, Paris, February, 1863.

³ In the *Literary Correspondence*, Paris, December 5, 1856.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*

did converse with him, and more than once, and that scandalous rumors caused Abelard to put an end to such visits.¹ How, then, can Heloise complain that, from the date of her monastic profession, that is, from 1119 or 1120, she has not enjoyed his presence or received one letter from him? Nevertheless, in one of these letters (y. 1133), she so expressed herself. Again, insists Lalanne, "granting that Heloise, and, after her time, the nuns of the Paraclete, preserved the letters of Abelard to her, can we unhesitatingly admit that, during a wandering life and until his death, Abelard preserved her letters, which breathed an ardent sensuality that must have necessarily compromised that reputation for wisdom and holiness which she had acquired? Finally, these letters are very labored; everything is arranged in order; the vehemence of their sentiments never, for a moment, interrupts their method. Their extreme length, their erudite and very exact quotations from the Bible, from the Fathers, and from pagan authors, all convince one that they are not penned by a correspondent, but were leisurely elaborated, and with infinite art."²

¹ In the *History of his Misfortunes*, p. 36, edit. Duchesne, 1616, Abelard defends himself from these charges.

² In regard to the famous tomb of Abelard and Heloise at Père-Lachaise, an eminent archæologist, Guilhermy (in the *Archæological Annals*, Paris, 1846) says: "We must demand satisfaction from those who show, every day, so little consideration for historical iconography, in propagating errors which prescription will eventually raise to the rank of truths. Take, for instance, one of our most popular monuments in the cemetery of Père Lachaise, the tomb of Abelard and Heloise. How many illusions would vanish, if the pilgrims who here perform their devotions only knew that, in the construction of this elegant sepulchral chapel, there entered not one stone from that severe and learned abbey of the Paraclete which romancing troubadours have treated as a kind of temple of Venus. The columns, capitals, and decorations of the four façades came from the cloister and some oratories of the monastery of St. Denis. The eyes of an expert are not required for the discovery that these sculptures were not originally destined for one and the same neighborhood. It was M. Lenoir, Director of the Museum of French Monuments, who conceived the idea of uniting some of the fragments placed at his disposal, so as to form a tomb fit to receive the ashes of the two illustrious lovers of the twelfth century. For the men who had thrown to the winds the venerable ashes of St. Geneviève, of St. Marcellus, of St. Bernard, of Suger, were clownishly sensitive when they opened the tomb of Abelard and Heloise; being of opinion that honors rendered to these 'victims of the cloister' would give a rude blow to a fanaticism which the guillotine was not extirpating quickly enough. Therefore a casket, sealed by the republican municipality of Nogent-sur-Seine, brought to Paris the ashes taken from the tomb of the Paraclete. But before the remains were placed in their last resting-place, the amateurs of a new kind of relics were to be satisfied. It is said that one of the soldiers at Valmy wore a talisman made from the moustache of Henry IV. Well, philosophers and atheists, probably olden levelers of heads, seized on the few teeth left in one of poor Heloise's jaws, as safeguards in their lusts. A tooth of Heloise cost a thousand francs; Abelard's were valued less highly. . . . The tomb was completed in the following manner: They took a bas-relief representing the funeral procession of Louis, son of St. Louis, and they decided that hereafter it should represent the obsequies of Abelard. The soul of the young prince, carried toward heaven by an angel, became that of the

It is certain that Abelard fell into several errors of doctrine, but there were many points in which his manner of expressing himself, rather than his teaching, was to be condemned.¹ The first condemnation of any error on the part of Abelard took place at the Synod of Soissons in 1121; he retracted what he was ordered to retract, and was sent back to his monastery by the Papal legate. But in after years, when he endeavored to discipline his unruly monks of St. Gildas, his adversaries accused him not only of again teaching the condemned doctrines, but of having put forth new errors. In the ranks of his accusers Abelard now saw the great St. Bernard, an adversary whose fame for sanctity and learning forbade any indifference. He therefore asked Henry, archbishop of Sens, to afford him an opportunity of defending his views in Bernard's presence. The prelate acquiesced, and a Synod was convoked to meet at Sens, in 1140. A large number of bishops and abbots, and King Louis VII., attended. At first the holy abbot of Clairvaux did not wish to be present, because it was improper, he said, to take up the consideration of opinions already condemned; but finally he yielded, lest the partisans of Abelard should boast that their leader's position was impregnable. When the Synod had met, certain extracts from Abelard's books were being read, when, to the surprise of all, the author arose, appealed to the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, and left the hall. Out of respect to the Holy See, the prelates then took no action in regard to the person of Abelard, but they condemned his errors, and sent a report of their proceedings to Pope Innocent II., beseeching him to repress the innovator's audacity. Samson of Rheims, Joscelin of Soissons, and other prelates now sent a letter to the Pontiff, the style of which plainly indicates that St. Bernard was its author. We give a part of it, because it shows the impression which Abelard had produced on men of undoubted zeal and learning. "Peter Abelard tries to nullify the merit of Christian faith, for he thinks that he can comprehend, with his human intelligence, all that God is. He ascends even unto heaven, and descends into the abysses; nothing is hid-

great doctor. Two medallions figured Abelard as a Cupid with curled moustache, and Heloise about as decent as a Messalina. In the sarcophagus you see two recumbent statues; one in clerical costume, and this is the Abelard so seductive above with flowing hair and moustache; the other is of a woman of the fourteenth century, and was originally on a tomb in the chapel of St. John of Beauvais, in Paris. How much this unknown lady has gained by her assumption of the name of Heloise! The grissettes bathe her with their tears, and bury her in crowns of *immortelles* for which they have paid ten cents at the gate; then the pitying creatures sit down, and read, as though they were prayers, two or three of the parodied letters of 'Loise and Bêlard.'

¹ Thus he thought the ideas of Plato concerning the divine goodness more elevated than those of Moses. "Dixit et Moyses omnia a Deo valde bona esse facta; sed plus aliquantulum landis divinæ bonitati Plato assignare videtur." (*Theol.* p. x., 1207).

den from him, whether it be in heaven above or in the depths of hell. In his own eyes he is a great man, disputing *de fide* against the faith, dealing with things above himself, an inquirer into majesty, a fabricator of heresies. Some time ago he composed a book on the Holy Trinity, but as errors were found in it, it was given to the flames by order of the legate of the Roman Church. Accursed is he who rebuilds the ruins of Jericho. That book has arisen from the dead, and with it many dead heresies have arisen, and appeared to many. At last it extends its influence to the sea and pushes its way even in Rome, for this man boasts that his book is received in the Roman court. Hence his error is strengthened, and he confidently preaches the word of iniquity on all sides. And when, in the presence of the bishops, the abbot of Clairvaux, armed with the zeal of justice and of faith, would have pressed him concerning these things, Abelard neither avowed nor denied them; but, without any provocation, and merely that he might persist in his iniquity, he appealed from the day, place and judge he himself had chosen, unto the Apostolic See. . . . We have proceeded in this affair so far as we dare; it is now for you, most blessed father, to provide that the beauty of the Church be not stained by any mark of heretical foulness."

In his own name, St. Bernard addressed two epistles to the Pontiff, and in the first (No. 189) we read: "Foolishly did I lately promise rest to myself, as though the fury of the lion had been appeased, and the Church would have peace. We have escaped a lion, but have encountered a dragon who is not less dangerous in ambush than the other roaring aloud. A new gospel and a new faith are proposed to the nations. Goliath advances his tall frame, equipped in all the panoply of war, and preceded by his squire, Arnold of Brescia. While attacking the doctors of the Church, he highly lauds the philosophers, preferring their inventions and his own novelties to the teaching of the Catholic fathers and the faith; and when all fly from before him, he selects me, the least of all, for single combat. At his request, the archbishop of Sens appointed a day for a meeting, in which Abelard would establish, if possible, the wicked doctrines against which I had presumed to murmur. I declined, both because I am a boy, while he is a warrior even from his youth, and because I judged it improper to submit to the agitation of petty human reason that faith which is surely founded on certain and enduring truth. . . . For this reason he cried the louder, called many together. . . . He declared everywhere that he would reply to me at Sens." St. Bernard also wrote concerning Abelard to all the Roman cardinals collectively, and especially to the cardinal Guido di Castello, who had been a disciple of the professor. In this latter letter he says:

"In his book, master Peter introduces profane novelties of speech and of meaning. He sees nothing as in a mirror and by enigma, but regards everything face to face. When he speaks of the Trinity, Arius seems to be talking; if he treats of grace, we hear Pelagius; and when he descants on the Person of Christ, he seems to be Nestorius." Writing to Cardinal Ivo, the saint thus depicts his adversary: "A monk under no rule, a prelate without charge, he neither holds any order nor is held by order. He is dissimilar to himself; within a Herod, without a John; he has nothing of a monk save name and dress. He is ignorant of nothing in heaven or on earth, excepting himself." If some of St. Bernard's expressions appear harsh, we must remember that he was defending the cause of truth, the interests of Catholic dogma, and therefore the interests of imperilled souls. In the mind and words of a true Catholic, there can be no compromise with heresy, and in dealing with Abelard, St. Bernard would have been foolish had he regarded him as an ignorant layman or a delicate school-girl under instruction. He was a "Goliath, equipped in all the panoply of war," and it was only the sharp pebble, sent straight at his brow, that was to bring him low. It is ridiculous for Mosheim to affect to believe that St. Bernard was jealous of Abelard. The saint was one of the last to enter the lists against the innovator, and it was principally because of the pressure brought to bear upon him by William, abbot of St. Thierry, that he moved in the matter. Before the Council of Sens he wrote amicably and urgently to Abelard, begging him to correct his books. Abelard, let us not forget, was also condemned at Rome, and are we to suppose that the Pontiff and cardinals were actuated by jealousy? Bernard was simply influenced by zeal for the truth, and the moment he found that his antagonist had retracted, he gave him a brother's hand, as we shall now see.

When Pope Innocent II. had received a report of the proceedings at Sens, he confirmed the condemnation of Abelard's errors, and enjoined perpetual silence on the master, "as upon a heretic." After departing from Sens, Abelard started for Rome, but hearkening to the fatherly voice of the venerable Peter of Cluny, he stopped in that monastery. Here he was reconciled to St. Bernard, as we are informed in the following letter, written by Peter to the Pontiff: "The master Peter, well known, as I believe, to your Wisdom, coming lately from France,¹ stopped at Cluny. We asked him whither he was journeying, and he replied that he was greatly vexed by certain parties who styled him a heretic, a name which he abhorred, and that he had appealed to the Apostolic Majesty. We applauded the design, and we advised him to fly to the

¹ Cluny was in Burgundy, which duchy was not joined to France until 1477.

acknowledged general refuge, telling him that the Apostolic justice, which had never failed a stranger, would not be refused to him. We promised that mercy, if reason there were for it, would be extended to him. In the meantime the lord abbot of the Cistercians arrived here, and he talked with Abelard and ourselves concerning peace between my lord of Clairvaux and the master. We also did all in our power toward a reconciliation, and we exhorted Abelard to accompany the Cistercian to Bernard, admonishing him to expunge from his books everything which might offend Catholic ears, as indeed Bernard and other good and wise men had already besought him to do. And this Abelard did, going and returning after having, through the mediation of the Cistercian, settled his olden differences with my lord of Clairvaux in a peaceful interview. Then, according to our advice, or rather, as we believe, inspired by God, he abandoned the tumults of the schools, and chose a permanent abode in your Cluny. Deeming this resolution fitting to his age, weakness, and piety, and feeling that his learning, not altogether unknown to you, would greatly advantage our community, we granted his request. Therefore, if it be agreeable to your Benignity, we graciously and joyfully allowed him to remain with us, your children; and hence I, whatever I may be, yet ever yours, do ask; and this convent of Cluny, most devoted to you, also asks; and he himself asks, by these letters which he has requested me to write, that you will order him to spend his remaining days, which perchance are few, in your Cluny; and that, through no influence, he be expelled or removed from the dwelling which, like a sparrow, he has found, or from the nest in which he, like a dove, rejoices, but that, as you ever cherish the good, and have loved even him, you will protect him with the Apostolic shield."

The reader may be interested by a brief summary of the errors of Abelard, as condensed from the accounts by St. Bernard,¹ by the abbot of St. Thierry,² and by Otho of Frisingen.³ First, he placed degrees in the Trinity, "modes" in the majesty, and numbers in the eternity of God; the Father is full of power, the Son is a certain power, and the Holy Ghost no power; the Son is to the Father as a certain power is to power, as a species is to genus, as a man is to animal. Second, he asserted that the Holy Ghost proceeds indeed from the Father and the Son, but not from the *esse* of the Father, or from the substance of the Son. Third, he denied that the devil ever had any right in man, and that the Son became man to redeem us from the dominion of Satan; the Son became man merely to show His love for us. Fourth, the Holy Ghost is the

¹ *Epistle 190 to Innocent II.*

² *Dispute against Abelard.*

³ *Deeds of Frederick I., book i., c. 47.*

soul of the world. Fifth, Christ, God and Man, is not the second person of the Trinity. Sixth, we can wish and do good without the aid of grace. Seventh, in the Eucharist the form of the prior substance remains in the air. Eighth, the punishment, not the guilt, of original sin descends to us from Adam. Ninth, there is no sin unless the act be in contempt of God. Tenth, ignorance always excuses from sin. Eleventh, diabolical suggestions often come from physical impressions, contact, etc. Twelfth, faith is the acceptance of things not seen. Thirteenth, there are limits to the Divine omnipotence; God could do no more than He has done or will do. Fourteenth, Christ did not descend into Limbo. Fifteenth, the final judgment of men can be attributed also to the Father. Sixteenth, the power of binding and loosing is doubtful. Seventeenth, God never impedes evil, changing the will of man. Eighteenth, the executioners of our Lord did not sin. Nineteenth, the spirit of the fear of God was not in Christ, and in the next world there will be no chaste fear of God. Such were the propositions in reference to which St. Bernard wrote to the cardinals at Rome: "Read, if you please, the book of Peter Abelard, which he says to be on Theology. You have it at hand, for he boasts that many in the court read it. See what he therein says about the Trinity, about the generation of the Son, about the Procession of the Holy Ghost, and the innumerable things he has which are foreign to Catholic ears and minds. Read also the book entitled his *Sentences*, and the one with the title, *Know Thyself*, and observe how rank they are with the seeds of sacrilege and of error; see his opinions as to the Person and Soul of Christ, His descent into Limbo, the Sacrament of the Altar, the power of binding and loosing, original sin, concupiscence, the sin of delectation, the sins committed through infirmity or ignorance, the work of sin, and the will to sin. If, then, you find that I have reason to be agitated, do you also be moved, and not in vain, but act for the place you occupy, for your dignity, and for the power you have received."

In his *Apology*, or Confession of Faith, Abelard declared that these errors were all ascribed to him through ignorance or malice; and he denied that he ever wrote a book of *Sentences*. But if the reader will follow Alexandre, as he examines the above nineteen propositions, one by one, he will find that many of them were distinctly taught by Abelard, although, in some cases, St. Bernard and the abbot of St. Thierry did not correctly apprehend his meaning. As for Abelard's denial that he wrote a book of *Sentences*, he thereby descended to an unworthy and puerile equivocation, for, though the book may not have borne that title, he did not disclaim the authorship of the passages to which St. Bernard objected, and which are found in that book. One great fault

of Abelard was his proneness to the use of incongruous illustrations in explaining matters of faith. Otho of Frisingen gives one instance which will serve for many: "As the proposition, argument, and conclusion are one and the same oration, so the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are the same essence."

Subjoined to the works of Abelard is found an *Apology* for the great master, written by Berengarius of Poitiers, who had been one of his disciples. The work of a young and ardent man, carried away by enthusiastic admiration for his teacher, it is extremely contumelious toward St. Bernard. Berengarius asserts that the saint tried to discover occasion to rebuke Abelard, rather than to effect his conversion. But we are told by Godfrey, a disciple of Abelard, and secretary to the saint, in his *Life of St. Bernard*, that the holy abbot, "with his usual benignity, desiring to correct the error, not to confound the man, privately admonished him; and so modestly and reasonably did he proceed that Abelard was touched, and promised to correct all according to his wish. But the good design was abandoned." Berengarius also says that his master, "whose mouth was the storehouse of reason, the trumpet of faith, and the dwelling of the Trinity," was condemned at Sens while absent, and unheard. But Abelard was contumacious, and had declined a judgment previously invoked by himself. Berengarius also attacks many points of doctrine which he alleges to have been put forth by St. Bernard, but in each case he misinterprets the saint's meaning. In his more mature age, this enthusiastic defender of Abelard modified his views, condemned his master's errors, and acknowledged the abbot of Clairvaux as "the Martin of our day, a shining light."

Abelard has often been stigmatized as a heretic, but unjustly. He did not pertinaciously adhere to his theories, but ever professed himself ready to correct them if found erroneous; and, in fact, he did correct them. In the prologue to his *Introduction*, he plainly avows his willingness to accept correction, "by force of reason or by scriptural authority," and declares that he will imitate St. Augustine in his *Retractions*, so that, "if he cannot be free from the vice of ignorance, he at least may not incur the guilt of heresy, for while ignorance does not make a man a heretic, obstinate pride does so make one." In the *Profession of Faith*, which he sent to Heloise, he says: "I wish not to so be a philosopher as to resist Paul; to so be an Aristotle as to be separated from Christ. There is no other name than His by which I can be saved. . . . And in order that trembling anxiety and all doubt may be removed from your heart, you may be sure of this, in my regard, that I have founded my conscience upon that rock on which Christ built His Church. . . . I believe that the Son is co-equal to the Father in

all things, in eternity, power, will, and deed ; nor do I hearken to Arius, who, moved by his perverse genius, yea, seduced by a demon, placed degrees in the Trinity, teaching that the Father is greater and the Son less. . . . I declare that the Holy Ghost is consubstantial and co-equal to the Father and the Son in all things. . . . I assert that in Baptism all sin is remitted ; that we need grace, both to commence good and to go on with it. . . . As for the resurrection of the body, why should I refer to it, when I would uselessly glory in being a Christian if I did not believe I would arise from the tomb ?" And in the last of his works, the *Apology*, dedicated "To all the Children of Holy Church," he wrote : " Well known is the saying that nothing can be so accurately expressed that it cannot be distorted ; and St. Jerome well observes that the author of many books creates many critics. And I, who have produced only a few little books, and those, if compared with others, of small importance, have not succeeded in avoiding censure ; although, as to the things of which I have been accused, I acknowledge, God knows, no fault of my own. If there were any such fault I would not obstinately defend it. I may have written some things which had better remained unpublished, but I protest before God, the judge of my soul, that in such matters I presumed nothing in malice or in pride. I have taught a long time and in many schools, and my doctrine has never been a sluggish stream or a hidden loaf. I have plainly declared what I deemed conducive to a proper presentation of the faith and of morals, and all my writings have been offered to judges rather than to disciples. I may have exceeded in my plethora of speech, for it is written that ' by much talking thou shalt not avoid sin,' but obstinate resistance has never made me a heretic, for I have always been ready to give satisfaction, either by destroying or by correcting all wrong utterances, and in that mind I shall persevere to the end. . . . Therefore, whatsoever I may be, let fraternal charity recognize me as a child of the Church ; as one who receives all that she receives, who rejects all that she rejects ; as one who, although inferior to others in virtue, has never impaired the unity of faith." And then Abelard expressly professes the Catholic doctrines which are contrary to all his own errors, or to those imputed to him.

PROF. MAX MÜLLER ON LANGUAGE AND THOUGHT.

IT is a principle often attributed to Aristotle, that one must be a god or a beast to be able to live without social intercourse. Without it, man is shut up in himself, a riddle to his neighbor and himself. Language alone raises the blinds and admits light into the abysses of the human soul; it alone reveals whether the heart is a "fountain sealed up," "a garden inclosed" or a slumbering volcano. From our earliest childhood to the silence of the grave, in joy and in sadness, amidst the pleasures of life and its severest duties, language is our constant friend and attendant. The pulpit and the platform, the novel and the imitation of Christ, the whole domain of science and the vast fields of literature are alike indebted to language. Its absence is worse than death—it is a living death. Solitary confinement leads, with but few exceptions, to mental derangement, and the cloister of the silent Trappists becomes bearable only for the love of Christ. It is not surprising, then, if the connection of language and thought has been always considered an interesting topic of study; and it is still less astonishing if publications of Prof. Max Müller on this subject have elicited an uncommon amount of scientific interest. Hardly had "The Science of Thought"¹ appeared when as many as fourteen or fifteen different letters were printed in *Nature*, some in favor of the aged orientalist's theory, some opposed to it, but all alike recognizing the importance and paramount interest of the subject. The book was styled "the most important contribution to English philosophic literature since Mill's examination of the philosophy of Sir William Hamilton,"² and at the same time the theory was represented as violent, exaggerated and impossible,³ as "a mere philological mare's nest," "a paradox."⁴ In spite of all this, the theory hardly deserves the name of novelty; it is difficult, indeed, even for a thinker of Max Müller's metal to propose a theory concerning the origin and nature of human thought that has not been clearly formulated before or is not, at least implicitly, contained in previous systems.

The theory of "The Science of Thought" has been rightly reduced to three principles by an able critic:⁵ 1. Language and thought are identical and inseparable. 2. The history of language is the history of thought, so that the human mind must be studied in language and its facts. 3. The analysis of all words would solve all questions of philosophy. The first principle is, of course,

¹ 1887, Ch. Scribners' Sons, New York.

² *The Dial*, 1887, p. 122.

³ *Contemporary Review*, December, 1888, p. 824.

⁴ *Ibid.*, October, 1888, p. 475.

⁵ *The Dial*, 1887, p. 123.

fundamental in the theory of Prof. Müller; with the identity or inseparableness of thought and language stand or fall the second and third propositions. All the critics recognize this by the fact that they pay serious attention to this point alone; and the author himself lays in the end all stress on the same thesis. An article written by him in self-defense¹ is entitled, "No Language Without Reason, No Reason Without Language." In "The Science of Thought" itself this is the only principle that has been fully developed and systematized, the other principles being considered as corollaries. Our whole knowledge is portioned off into four pigeon holes: sensations, percepts, concepts, names. Sensation is nothing but the reaction of a self-conscious monon under the active influence of something external. By a process of subjective evolution our sensations develop into percepts or presentations, and these again into concepts and names. Names are, however, admitted to be conventional signs. Though no theory concerning the origin of names is given as certain, still we clearly understand that Prof. Noiré's system has found special favor in the eyes of his friend, Max Müller. In fact, it is principally owing to the linguistic work of the latter that the system has attained to anything like internal probability. All language is reduced by him to about one hundred and twenty-one roots, all of which denote originally action and owe their existence to the "clamor concomitans." The latter is explained in the following way: When men exert themselves, their nerves and muscles naturally contract or expand and communicate this same agitated state to other parts of the body which cannot find immediate relief by the resistance of the work itself. Thus, certain actions always affect the nerves of the tongue and the whole speaking apparatus in a certain way; these seek relief by giving vent to certain sounds, varying according to the stress of the vocal chords. Hence arises the "clamor concomitans," which after a while develops into a "clamor significans." The needs of primitive man being few and simple, his actions too were contained within the limit of one hundred and twenty-one varieties, and to these correspond the one hundred and twenty-one roots to which the whole of language is reduced. So much for the general features of Noiré's theory as adopted by Prof. Müller.

To do justice to Prof. Max Müller's theory we shall first consider the limitations with which it is proposed, then proceed to examine it, not according to the value of the arguments brought forward in its favor, but according to its own intrinsic merit. We do not consider arguments as so many useless darts of idle controversy; but even great men may, at times, defend a good cause by

¹ *Nature*, July, 1887, p. 249.

bad arguments, and not rarely has a light-armed dialectician defended a falsehood by specious reasoning.

The preface of "The Science of Thought" invites, however, a few preliminary remarks. The author has, of course, a right to a father's tenderness for his offspring, and rightly begs that the book may not be tested "by mere shibboleths or condemned by being called names"; but he ought to remember all the mischief he has done by hall-marking the bow-wow theory. Again, the preface leads us to expect something entirely new, while the book overwhelms us with a shower of quotations from various authors, ranging from Abelard to Mill and Schopenhauer, showing that all of these thinkers held the author's theory, to a certain extent, at least. One more instance of Prof. Müller's inconsistency: On page 5 of his "Science of Thought" Mr. Mill is blamed for his inconsistency of reasoning from the sagacity of animals, while he confesses: "I do not know what passes in a mole's mind." Now, in *Nature*¹ the Professor himself says: "I prefer, indeed, as I have often said, to remain a perfect agnostic with regard to the inner life of animals"; but elsewhere he, too, is inclined to give the animal mind the preference over the human understanding.

In the investigation of the exact position of Prof. Müller with regard to the relation of language to thought, it will be most conducive to clearness to hear first the doubts and objections of his opponents. But here, again, we must distinguish between the opponents who deny the Professor's premises and those who deny his inference; the former oppose him on metaphysical, the latter on logical, grounds. Against the proposition, "No thought without language," Mr. F. Galton² objected that a single instance to the contrary sufficed to render that thesis untenable, and such an instance he presented in his own person. He attests that he can think without words in mechanics, at billiards, when fencing, when crossing a river by jumping from stone to stone, and even in algebra and geometry. The Duke of Argyll calls attention to the fact that parrots have often a highly-developed faculty of articulation without being on that account more clever than other birds.³ Mr. Hyde Clarke⁴ refers to the mutes of the seraglio at Constantinople, who lead an intellectual life and take interest in politics, though they are deprived of language. Mr. T. Mellard Reade⁵ attests that he is able to think without words in matters of geology and mechanics. Mr. Harold Picton⁶ appeals to the frequent occurrence when we have a word "on the tip of the tongue," but cannot express the idea we possess so clearly and distinctly.

¹ July, 14, 1887, p. 250.

² *Nature*, May 19, 1887, p. 52.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Nature*, May 12, 1887, p. 28.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Nature*, June 9, 1887, p. 125.

To answer all these facts Prof. Müller has recourse to definitions;¹ he denies that mechanics, fencing, and billiards fall under the definition of thought. Chess, he admits, would fall under it. In algebra, he says, we inhibit language rather than dispense with it. When we must look for a word to express ourselves, we have not yet a clear thought; as soon as our thought passes from the general to the individual, our words, too, change from "thing," "chose," "man," to "steam-engine," "carbonic acid," "lieutenant of the second fusilier regiment." Monkeys, dogs, and deaf-mutes may, indeed, be taught dominoes; but left to themselves, they cannot invent it. In the case of deaf-mutes the Professor seems to lose his ordinary kindly disposition; he professes himself an agnostic with regard to their inner life as much as with regard to the inner life of animals. Surely, logic makes tyrants of us all—Mr. George J. Romanes² infers from the answer of Max Müller that thought once attained may continue without words. Aphasia, he says, proves that this is no mere conjecture. Consequently, the absolute dependence of thought on language asserted in "The Science of Thought,"³ must be denied. Mr. Joseph J. Murphy⁴ thinks the independence of thought on language in a few particular cases of little practical importance, nay, he maintains that such an independence must be admitted in the investigation of things falling under the senses. He implies, nevertheless, that language is necessary for the training of the mind. Prof. Müller in a later article⁵ made these statements his own.

Next we give a summary of Prof. Max Müller's opponents on logical grounds. Mr. Ebbels⁶ finds fault with the definition of language given in "The Science of Thought." It is all very well to speak of "thought-words" and "word-thoughts" as constituting language; but, as a matter of fact, it is not only in them that we think, but also in pictures. Besides, to deny that our mental operations become real thought until they become "addition and subtraction," is to reduce the whole question to a quarrel of words. Mr. Arthur Nicols⁷ attacks the proposed system on logical grounds, too. He brings together the two following propositions of the Professor: "Of course we all admit that without a name we cannot really know anything," and "one fact remains, animals have no language." The inference flowing from these premises goes entirely against Prof. Müller's philosophical tenets in matters of animal intelligence. The Duke of Argyll, too, is a powerful

¹ *Nature*, June 2, 1887, p. 100 f. and July 14, 1887, p. 249 ff.

² *Nature*, June 23, 1887, p. 171 ff.

⁴ *Nature*, *ibid.*

⁵ *Nature*, June 23, 1887, p. 172.

³ Pp. 63 and 64.

⁶ *Nature*, July 14, 1887, p. 249 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.*

opponent of the new system from a logical standpoint.¹ The Professor's definition of language is called in question by him, because in its compass nothing can be acknowledged as language that is not locally identified with thought. English, spoken to a Chinaman, ceases to be language. Then His Grace appeals to the division of human knowledge into sensations, percepts and concepts; for every concept implies abstraction and therefore subtraction, though not every concept is admitted by Max Müller to the dignity of thought. Again, in "The Science of Thought" it is understood that we may have sensations and percepts without words; but, on the other hand, it is denied that we can have sensations and percepts without thought. Hence we can have thought without words.

After listening to the arguments of Prof. Müller's opponents we are better able to understand the various positions he himself has taken at different periods with regard to the identity of thought and language. The limitations and qualifications he has added to his theory will appear clearest by considering the definitions of language and thought he has successively given and the various kinds of necessary connection he has tried to establish between these two terms, and also the principal analogies by which he has explained and beautified his favorite theory. First, then, must be considered the successive definitions of language. In the beginning, no doubt, Prof. Müller meant by language what he analyzed as language, namely, the resultant final compound of those elements to which he himself had reduced language. Now, this is nothing else but significant articulate sound, either pronounced or expressed in writing or conceived in thought. But when the deaf-mutes loom up before the mental eye of the Professor, he finds it convenient to widen his range of language, comprising now all signs of communication, whether sounds or gestures. The hand as a possible sign for five, hands and feet as signs for twenty, serve as illustrations of such wordless thoughts. Such signs, we are told, are rather the signs of signs than the signs of concepts, and, in the end, we always return from the *notà notæ* to what is denoted by the first *nota* or sign. How deaf-mutes do this, we are not informed. But even thus modified, did language not fit into Max Müller's system. He advanced, therefore, boldly a step farther, carrying the domain of language into the realm of mind. Language consists of names, and a name is that by which a thing becomes known (*notum*).² Language and thought are then but two different names for the same thing, or at most they are two different views of the

Contemporary Review, December, 1888, p. 806 ff.

² *Nature*, June 2, 1887, p. 101.

same object, much like the two sides of a medal. Well might Mr. Shorey, in his review of "The Science of Thought," say that the author's hand had lost none of its old cunning.¹ And as if this identity of thought and language were not yet sufficient to satisfy the pride of any linguist, the Professor advanced another step. In "The Science of Thought" we are told "a name is nothing if it is not the name of a thing, and a thing is nothing if it is not the thing of a name."² After such a statement the author need not be afraid of being called a nominalist; he is rather a realist of the most advanced kind. The necromancer of the Middle Ages would have seen in this theory a scientific basis for his art, and through its magic spell would have exercised his power over everything namable in heaven, on earth, and under the earth.

If the linguist thus widens the limits of language at pleasure, he is not afraid either of narrowing the definition of thought. At first, thought is defined in the words of Hobbes as "addition and subtraction." Brevity of definition is no doubt convenient in argument, but truth is more satisfactory in the end; not that the definition given by Prof. Müller is not true so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. In mathematics it is very well to reduce all operations to addition and subtraction as the foundation, because in mathematics everybody knows quantities are to be added or subtracted. But in the realm of thought Prof. Max Müller himself admits four factors: sensations, percepts, concepts, and names. Which of these have to be added and subtracted to generate thought? Perhaps the mere addition or subtraction of none of them would present thought according to the author's mind; subtraction he may take as abstraction, addition as generalization. But then, again, every concept would be thought, which the Professor does not admit. Nor does he wish to have "thought" applied to sentences or clauses alone, because he maintains that some words are thought. The word "dog" is thus elevated to the dignity of thought as we see from a practical argument for the new theory; for this word serves as an illustration that there is no thought without words. The title of one of Max Müller's articles in *Nature*³ bears witness that he found it convenient later to restrict the meaning of thought to reason; the title reads: "No Reason Without Language. . . ." To prevent all misunderstanding in this matter, we must have recourse to another explanation given by the author himself:⁴ "Thinking has been used by Descartes and other philosophers in a much wider sense also, so as to include sensation, passions, and *intuitive judgments*, which clearly

¹ *The Dial*, October, 1888, p. 121.

² July 14, 1887, p. 249.

³ P. 34.

⁴ *Nature*, June 2, 1887, p. 100.

require no words for their realization." But are not intuitive judgments an "addition or subtraction"? Or if they are excluded from the grade of "thought," notwithstanding, concepts, too, ought to be excluded from it, since intuitive judgments consist of concepts and something besides.

Finally, the kind of connection existing between thought and language must be considered, taking language in its conveniently widened, and thought in its unduly restricted, sense. The very title of the first publication, "The Science of Thought," gives us a clue to the author's opinion on the subject. For if the science of language is the science of thought, practically language must be identical with thought, an inference that may be proved correct by reference to almost any page of the book. And far from retracting his opinion, the Professor seems to hold it more firmly as time goes on. In the *Contemporary Review*¹ he again insists: "If we distinguish at all between concepts and words, we are bound to say that concepts are due to words, . . . and not, as most philosophers will have it, that words are due to concepts"; and again, in the same article, "our whole mental property consists in names." But at times the Orientalist seems to have wavered in his position. In *Nature*² he thinks that the Duke of Argyll has conceded his whole thesis in the concession that language seems to be necessary to *the progress* of thought, but not at all necessary for the mere act of thinking. And in the same article³ we read: "Mr. Murphy is one of those who agree with me that language is necessary to thought, and that, though it may be possible to think without words, when the subjects of thought are visible things and their combinations, as in inventing machinery, the intellectual power that invents machinery has been matured by the use of language."

We see clearly from this investigation that the new theory has not yet crystallized in the inventor's mind. He wavers in his definition of language; he shifts his ground in the definition of thought; he doubts with regard to the kind of nexus existing between those two unknown quantities; in other words, he knows not whether x is equal to y or greater or smaller than y . But the "cunning hand" of the experienced author knows how to conceal this state of unpleasant doubt by giving us a great deal of irrelevant delightful chit-chat, *de omni re scibili et de quibusdam aliis*, and also by using several very plausible analogies. We learn that Müller's "Waldmann," the father of the late Matthew Arnold's "Geist," still flourishes in his green old age. Besides Darwinism and Mill's "Logic," Schopenhauer and Panini's "Grammar," the Vedas and Max Müller's honorable position in English society, Sanskrit roots

¹ October, 1888, p. 485.

² July 14, 1887, p. 249.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

and Kant's "Philosophy" form as many rich sources for amusing detail. Then we are informed that language is to thought what anatomy is to biology. Now, suppose a text-book entitled "The Science of Biology" should tell us that biology is nothing but a vital addition and subtraction of organic elements, that all of these may be classified under the headings flesh, bone, and muscle, or more scientifically under the sixty-five elements of chemistry, which are subject to certain properties representable by circles and spheres, so that if the same sphere can hold two or more elements entirely or partially, those two or more elements form an organic cell fit to enter as integral part into a living body. Suppose, finally, that same text-book should venture to enunciate the thesis, "anatomy and biology are identical," Prof. Müller himself would be the first to denounce the book, because it confuses terms and sciences, and while trying to simplify knowledge points back to the infancy of surgery as to the great ideal of biological study. It is surprising that Prof. Müller has not perceived that he has dealt in the same way with the science of the mind. Prehistoric savages might be pardoned for confusing language with thought; but in the light of modern science such mistakes should not happen even with a biased specialist. The sophistry of another analogy has been pointed out in the *Contemporary Review*,¹ and needs therefore only to be mentioned. Max Müller has said: "We can distinguish between the sound and the meaning of a word just as we can distinguish between the pitch and the timbre of our voice." This either contradicts the author's own position or it means nothing at all. For the pitch and timbre of our voice are the natural constituent elements of the same; the pitch might indeed be present without the accompanying harmonics, but then the identity of the voice would be destroyed. While in matters of language the Professor himself declares that the meaning of a word is not a natural constituent part of the same, he maintains, on the contrary, that it is arbitrary. It would have been more correct to say: We may distinguish between the sound and the meaning of a word just as we may distinguish between the African lion and our association of it with Great Britain.

Prof. Max Müller's gossip has been mentioned above; but we must also consider his more weighty vagaries, since they are apt to prepossess a conservative reader in the author's favor. Whatever clever arguments the Professor may bring up to the contrary, the connection of thought and language or their separability has nothing to do with the descent of man. Man is a son of Adam, even if the wild duck can warn its young ones of approaching

¹ December, 1888, p. 809.

danger by a sharp "quack," and even if the huntsman can know that he is discovered by the voice of the shy animal he pursues. The tender cry of the female mammal has as little influence on man's descent as the fact that the ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib. Nor have materialism and spiritism more to fear from Darwin's "dangerous man" than Darwin's theory of evolution. The inseparableness of thought and language no more obliges us to use "matter" in the objective case only and "spirit" in the nominative, than his abundance of wine obliges the Italian or Frenchman to use wine for drinking only, water for washing. It is, indeed, a spirit alone, or a spiritual substance, that can really think; but it is not matter alone that we can think of. The etymology of the word matter is of no value here; the present usage of the word makes it signify an extended and resistant subject, a substance that can be made the bearer of material energy. The Duke of Argyll rightly warns Max Müller to beware of "back-tracks." These may present a great many interesting facts when the history of a word is in question, or when we deal in a dead language with a word that occurs only once in the whole literature of that language. But to learn the right usage of a word in any living language, we apply for information to our standard writers and speakers rather than to Prof. Müller's "back-tracks."

In "The Science of Thought," as well as in his letters, Prof. Müller repeatedly complains of the neglect of Kant in our days; he is surprised how any one can claim to deal in philosophic thought without having read the works of that illustrious thinker. On the present subject the old scholastic philosophy would have served the Professor better than Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" has done. The tenets held by the scholastics in this matter are clearer and better defined than any thesis formulated by Kant or his school. First we are told :- Thought is impossible without a mental word (*verbum mentale*), at least in our present state of existence.¹ About the vision of God and the knowledge of pure spirits after the soul has been separated from the body we need not speak here, since at present all our knowledge is had through the senses, as will be shown in the next paragraph. Nor is there need to develop the various opinions of the scholastic philosophers concerning the mental word. It suffices to state in general that when the object of knowledge is not physically present in the intellect, it must, in order to be known, be united to the intellect by means of its picture. Or, to present the same in another way, our intellect knowing an object differs from our intellect not knowing that object, and this difference has its foundation in the physical state of

¹ S. Thom., *Summa c. gent.* l. i; c. 53; l. 4 c. 11.

the intellect itself. Now, the physical something which has modified our intellect in the act of cognition may be called the *verbum mentale*. Whether thought consists in this mental word, or in the action producing it, or in its union with the intellect, or in both the mental word and its productive action taken together, or in any other quality, action or passion connected with the same, does not affect the truth of our thesis that in our present state of existence thought is impossible without a mental word.

We have noticed, of course, that the "mental word" of the last paragraph differs widely from Prof. Max Müller's "thought-word." It differs, also, widely from the *verbum mentale* of G. J. Romanes,¹ who seems to express nothing by that term but a spoken word rehearsed within the recesses of our memory. But the second step of scholastic philosophy in this subject approaches nearer to the level of Prof. Max Müller and his critics. The scholastic thesis may be worded: While the soul is united to the body, our intellect depends on our imagination, not, indeed, in its being and action, but in the subject-matter of its action. Max Müller also admits this; worded in his language, it reads: "Percepts produce concepts," or, better, "no concept is without its corresponding percept." Hence the old axiom, *nihil est in intellectu quod prius non fuerit in sensu*.² But the schoolmen did not stop here; they further ask whether a thought once had may be rehearsed independently of the imagination. And this, too, is commonly answered in the negative. The facts alleged as proofs seem to raise this opinion to the certainty of a thesis. For, in the first place, experience teaches that our intellectual operations cease with the working of our imagination. Thus, when fast asleep, or when afflicted with brain disease, our intellectual faculties are at rest. Again, even purely spiritual objects, such as God and His angels, virtue and vice, and the like, cannot be thought of without an accompanying picture in the imagination, a "percept," to use Prof. Müller's language.

The schoolmen have, in the third place, explored Prof. Müller's own field. To do this thoroughly they asked themselves two questions: 1. Is there a connection between language and thought, language being taken in the sense of sound-language, though the sense of sign language is not entirely excluded? 2. In case such a connection exists, is it based on an absolute necessity of language to thought, or on mere utility? All scholastic philosophers answer the first question in the affirmative,³ for the dependence of the

¹ *Nature*, June, 23, 1887, p. 172.

² Cf. S. Thom., *Summ. Theol.* I, q. 84 a 7; a, 8 ad 1; q. 89, a 1; q. 85 a 1; q. 87, a 3 ad 1; *de memor. et remin. lect.* 1. *Quaest. disput.* q. 2, *de verit.* a 6; q. 10 *de verit.* a, 6, ad 2.

³ Cf. S. Thom. *Summ. Theol.*, 2 a, 6 c, 10; 2 a 2 æ, q. 55, a 4 ad 2; q. 72, a 1 c 2, 110, a 1 ad—S. Aug. *De doct. Chrst.* l. 2 c. 3 circ med.

intellect on the imagination for its thought material being once admitted, thought is naturally connected with the pictures of the imagination ; now, language presents in its various words shorter and clearer and more definite pictures or "percepts" than we can expect to attain in any other way. Hence, whatever substitutes for language may be devised by our modern educators of youth, whether pictures or objects, or abstruse mathematics, language will triumph in the end. Other percepts may be found easier and more satisfactory up to a certain point, but they will never be found in sufficient number and clearness for the purposes of practical life ; indeed, any percept fountain besides language will, in our social life, often prove a hindrance rather than a help.

The second question concerning the *kind* of connection between language and thought is variously answered by the schoolmen, and here especially might Prof. Müller have profited by giving a few hours to the reading of scholastic philosophy. He would have found that the school of traditionalism—a recent opponent of scholasticism—pretty nearly held the same tenets which he himself expressed in "The Science of Thought." De Bonald (1754–1840)¹ and H. F. R. de Lamennais (1782–1854)² proposed their doctrine in the following way: 1. As vision is impossible without light, so thought is impossible without language. 2. Man could never have attained to either language or thought through his own strength, hence divine revelation was necessary. 3. God gave thought to man by giving a ready-made language to primitive man. 4. All the descendants of Adam acquire thought only through education and language. Those two thinkers were not afraid of what Prof. Max Müller would call a miracle. They perceived that their system could not be defended without it, and so their followers knew what to defend and their opponents what to attack.

The system of Traditionalism was proposed by Bonnetty³ and Ventura⁴ in a somewhat different form. Bonnetty holds: 1. Language, and consequently primitive revelation, is absolutely necessary to the knowledge of metaphysical, moral, and religious truths. 2. Other thoughts we may acquire without the aid of revelation, as well as rehearse without the help of language any thought once had. Ventura requires language and primitive revelation as absolutely necessary to a clear and distinct thought of God, spirit, soul, immor-

¹ *Recherches philos. sur les premiers objets des connaissances morales*, c. 2, t. i., p. 145. *Essais sur les lois naturelles de l'ordre social*, p. 49–111. *Legislation primitive*, t. i., p. 74–334.

² *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion*, t. 2.

³ *Annales de phil. chrét.*, ser. 4, t. 7, p. 63, 64, 67, and t. 8, p. 374.

⁴ *La tradizione, e i Semipelagiani della Filosofia*, c. 1, § 6, p. 23 ; ff. and c. 6, § 204, ff.

ality, moral duty, and such like objects, while the thoughts, "being," "cause and effect," "good and evil," may be had without revelation. For us Catholics it is important to know that by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, given June 11, 1855, and approved by His Holiness Pope Pius IX., June 15 of the same year, the following propositions were presented to Bonnetty for subscription: 1. Reason can prove the existence of God, the spirituality of the soul, the liberty of man, to a certainty. Faith comes after revelation, and can therefore not be used conveniently to prove the existence of God to an atheist, or the spirituality and liberty of the soul to a naturalist and fatalist. 2. The use of reason precedes faith, and leads man to faith by the help of revelation and grace. 3. The method followed by St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and other later scholastics does not lead to rationalism. . . .¹ Bautain had subscribed to the first and second of these propositions as early as 1840. To prevent all misunderstanding, it must be stated that we do not intend to question the claim of Max Müller to the theory contained in "The Science of Thought," but to show that the same order of thoughts had held the attention of eminent thinkers long before the rise of the present controversy.

But traditionalism has not fully disappeared yet. The followers of the above-named leaders grant that without language we can have a confused and vague knowledge of metaphysical, moral, and religious truths. They grant, in the second place, that after the native crude powers of human understanding are developed, man may, without the aid of revelation, acquire the other natural truths; but for the development of his understanding, and for a clear and distinct knowledge of metaphysical, moral, and religious truth, man depends on language and revelation; not indeed as on the efficient cause of such development and knowledge, but as on an absolutely necessary condition. Against the theory thus worded we possess no positive ecclesiastical document, but reason rebels against such arbitrary limitations of its domain. The very nature of language, a complex of arbitrary signs as it is, prevents words from occupying such a high position in the world of thought. The stars and stripes of the American flag will never excite in the mind of the savage New Zealander the idea of the United States of North America either as cause or as necessary condition. A series of unpleasant experiences has to teach the barbarian first that there is something more in the flag than canvas and dye.

Barring the limits of necessity in this question of the connection of language and thought, scholastic philosophy is prepared to concede to Prof. Max Müller any amount of utility the professor

¹ *Denzinger Enchiridion*, n. n., 1506, 1507, 1508.

himself may wish to ascribe to language in the field of mental labor. The old saying of Lord Bacon that reading makes a full man, writing an exact man, and speaking a ready man, summarizes the beneficial effects of language on thought in an admirable manner. Language presents the mind with suitable food, stimulates its appetite, and regulates its digestion. Hence the importance of a due proportion between reading, writing, and speaking. Any one of these functions practised to excess, the mental state of man will show its bad effect. Man becomes either a mental glutton or an empty gossip, or a narrow pedant. Prof. Max Müller would no doubt confer a benefit on the rising generation and on posterity were he to employ the power of his pen in the question discussed at present in books and periodicals, how to educate our youth. With his enthusiasm for language and its necessity to thought, he might do a great deal to save the living generation from unintentionally dwarfing the minds of its young ones and posterity from a generation of mental monstrosities, "ever learning and never attaining to the knowledge of truth."

NOTE.—Since this article was written, a reply of Prof. Max Müller to his Grace, the Duke of Argyll, has appeared in the March number of the *Nineteenth Century*. With regard to the Professor's arguments, nothing has been changed in his last production; his thesis still reads as presented in this article: $x = > < y$. Prof. Noiré, whom in March Prof. Müller numbered among the living with M. Taine, Prof. Jewett and Sir James Stephen, has since then passed to his eternal reward.

THE CHURCH OF THE ATTAKAPAS—1750-1889.

I.

ABOUT 6 A.M., August 16, 1887, Père Jan, Pastor of St. Martinsville, La., was found dead in his poor, dusty room. He had retired at 9 the previous night to pray rather than to rest, though a man far up in the eighties might well have been weary after so full a day. He had celebrated two Masses and preached at each, heard many confessions, given Holy Communion to the greater number of his congregation, presided at Vespers, and held the Blessed Sacrament aloft over his people, for the last time, in solemn benediction. He lay against the bed partially kneeling—had not even undressed. The peaceful, smiling expression of his venerable countenance showed that the beautiful soul had departed without a struggle. The doctor declared he must have died some seven hours previous. So the Blessed Virgin had taken him on her greatest feast.

His death was telegraphed to New Orleans, and people asked each other: "Who is this Père Jan?" Save a few of the clergy, nobody seemed to know or care. He had lived between the porch and the altar; had never been in the city save in passing on his arrival in this country, thirty-seven years previous. To his simple flock he was all the world, but otherwise his life was as solitary as if he had lived in the Thebaid.

Yet the old priest that lay dead in St. Martinsville had seen stirring times. He had lived through the latter years of the first French Republic; remembered the fleeting glory of the great Napoleon's empire; shared the anxiety of the Hundred Days; and rejoiced, like a loyal Breton as he was, at the restoration of the Bourbons and monarchy.

Ordained May 26, 1826, by Archbishop de Quélen, at Notre Dame, with sixty others, among whom was Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, he said his first Mass on Trinity Sunday at the Convent des Carmes, memorable as the scene of the massacre of so many priests in 1792. The Abbé Surrat, his intimate friend who attended him, lived to witness scenes scarcely less horrible than those of '92, and became the victim of another massacre, second in atrocity only to that of the *Carmes*, when he was assassinated by the Communists in the fair city by the Seine forty-five years later.

On the return of Charles X. from Rheims, Père Jan acted as chief of the *mâîtres de cérémonies* at the grand *Te Deum* at Notre Dame. Often did the simple priest in far-away St. Martinsville smile to think that he, on so great an occasion, had given the order

laisser passer to so many distinguished personages, among others his friend, Mgr. de Frayssinous, Minister of Public Instruction. A few years later he saw the flight of the same Charles, that typical Bourbon who could neither learn nor forget.

He had been the friend or fellow-student of nearly all the great churchmen of the Paris of his day, and among them all loved Lacordaire best.

It was the apostolic life of this holy priest that first drew the attention of the writer to the remote region blessed and sanctified by his labors. We shall return to this latest and greatest Apostle of the Attakapas.

II.

South Carolina is divided into districts, Louisiana into parishes; the divisions of the other States are counties. Five Louisiana parishes cover the ancient Attakapas country: St. Martin, St. Mary, Iberia, Lafayette, and Vermillion, lying between the Mississippi and the Mexican Gulf. Ecclesiastically, the Attakapas region once formed but a single parish, extending from Grand Coteau to Berwick Bay, and from the Atchafalaya to the Gulf of Mexico, an area of some thousands of square miles. A commandant ruled this fair country, politically known as the "Poste des Attakapas."

Into these green savannahs white men found their way very early. The first permanent settlers were a few families driven from Canada by the English. Their descendants are scattered over the wilds of Louisiana to-day. Some settled at the "Poste des Attakapas," as the Broussards, Martins, Le Blancs, Voorhies, Arcenaux, still numerously represented in St. Martinsville and its vicinity. Some New Orleans men, more adventurous than their brethren, "prospected" in these prairies, and a few settled down, "the world forgetting and by the world forgot," with Indian brides, whose dark eyes and swarthy complexions may be traced in their descendants to-day. The traditions of the country assert that the first of these migrations occurred between 1750 and 1760, during the administration of the Marquis de Vandreuil and Governor Kerlerec.

The immense plains, stretching to the Gulf, afforded such facilities for raising cattle that the immigrants chose a pastoral rather than an agricultural life. Bayous of pure, limpid water furnished delicious fish, and game was abundant. Much of their time was therefore spent in hunting and fishing. But the extraordinary richness of the soil, which yields several crops a year, did not long remain undiscovered. Indigo, cotton, rice, and tobacco soon varied the green monotony of these fertile pampas. Sugar-cane was introduced by the Jesuits in 1751, and seed-cane distributed throughout the various plantations. This made a great addition to home

comfort. But in 1795 sugar became a gold mine to Louisiana, when the syrup the cane yields was made to granulate on Boré's plantation near New Orleans.¹ This was a boon to the dwellers in the Attakapas. Nowhere are there finer sugar plantations than on the banks of the Tèche.

The first pale faces who arrived here found Attakapas Indians scattered throughout the territory. They had given up the man-eating propensities from which they took their name, and tradition assures us that there were among them many Christians.

By an arrangement, the wisdom of which has been often questioned, the Capuchins of the Province of Champagne attended to the spiritual wants of New Orleans, while the Jesuits preached the Gospel to the outlying Indian tribes. So, when the adventurous Canadians pushed westward to the Tèche country, they found the Indians partially Christianized and civilized. We know the name of but one Jesuit who preached to them in their native wilds, and that belongs to a later period—Father Viel,² who, besides his ministrations to them, taught a small school for the children of the dwellers in this romantic region.

III.

Even in the days of Bienville, who left America forever in 1747, the Attakapas and the pale faces had met. The romantic story of Belle-Isle is repeated to-day under the spreading oaks that fringe the sparkling bayous, and by the hunters and fishers of the Salt Marsh Parishes. In 1719 he sailed from France with many troops and emigrants. Losing their reckoning in a storm, they made land at St. Bernard's Bay, Texas. The captain sent ashore for fresh water. Belle-Isle and four other officers remained on land when the boat went back with her casks replenished. While awaiting their return for a second cargo the loiterers found so much to interest them that

¹ Etienne de Boré, a wealthy, influential planter, signalized himself by his humanity and charity to the Jesuits when they were suppressed in Louisiana in 1763. It was he who gave a home to the venerable Father Baudouin, S. J., a Canadian, whose health was irretrievably broken by his labors and sufferings among the Indians. He would not allow the holy missionary to be driven, at the age of seventy-two, from the country in which the greater part of his life had been spent. Mr. de Boré was grandfather to Charles Gayarré, the historian of Louisiana.

² Etienne Bernard Alexandre Viel was born in New Orleans in 1736, and died in France in his 86th year. After the suppression of the Society of Jesus he lived for many years in Attakapas, where he was much beloved. The greater part of his life was spent in teaching. Many considered him the greatest living Latinist. Judge Gayarré told the writer that he was a fanatic in his love for Latin, and thought nothing fit to be published except what was in Latin. He translated Telemachus into beautiful Latin verse, and the work was splendidly brought out by some distinguished men who had been his pupils. Gayarré, in his youth, saw that work and others from the same learned pen.

time passed quickly, and on reaching the shore they saw to their dismay that the vessel had departed.

The unfortunate men found they had exchanged the perils of the ocean for those of the wilderness. They hoped, but in vain, that the captain might send a boat back for them. The keen gnawings of hunger they stayed with berries, worms, and insects. Belle-Isle's hunting dog was doomed, but he could not slay it, and the poor animal escaped when another essayed to do the deed.

One by one his companions died of hunger. He buried them, and "watered their graves with his tears." After the burial of the last his truant dog returned with a wood-rat, which gave master and dog a dainty meal. Once, while his master slept, a panther stealthily approached him, which the dog attacked and vanquished, but was so badly lacerated that his master compassionately put an end to his sufferings.

Again, alone in the wilds, Belle-Isle reverently knelt to thank God for his safety, and implore His further protection. By traces of human footprints he was guided to a pirogue tossing in a stream. Crossing to the other side, he saw Indians feasting. They were man-eaters (Attukapaw). The cadaverous Frenchman they regarded as a spectre. He made signs that he was hungry, whereupon they offered him human flesh and fish. No need to say he chose the latter.

The Indians spared his life, intending to fatten him for a barbecue. They took him to their village and appropriated his miserable belongings. He was made slave to a widowed squaw, who treated him well, and whose papooses he aired in a cradle fastened to his bare shoulders. The prospect of being sacrificed to their deities, and having his flesh served up at their revels, retarded his improvement. He soon acquired their language and had the happiness to learn that the warriors in council assembled had decided it would be base and treacherous to kill a stranger who had come to their wigwams for hospitality.

His mistress allowed him considerable liberty. He accompanied the braves on their hostile excursions. Human flesh and venison were the delicacies prepared for these expeditions. Once, when he unwittingly ate a piece of dried human flesh, the savage commissary said: "You improve. You will soon be a true Attakapas, and 'eat man' as well as any of us." This, with the powerful aid of the imagination, brought about an inversion of the muscles of the epigastric region; a violent upheaval and the loss of a dinner followed.

After some years, deputies from a distant tribe came to smoke the calumet with the cannibals. Seeing Belle-Isle, they remarked that there were pale faces in a neighboring nation, also. He questioned them. Fortunately he had preserved his commission as an

officer. On the reverse of it he wrote with a crow-quill and ink manufactured from soot :

"I am M. de Belle-Isle who was abandoned at St. Bernard's Bay. My companions died of grief and hunger. I am a captive among the Attakapas." This "talking paper" he begged an Indian to convey to the French Chief in New Orleans, who would liberally reward him. Another Indian tried to take it, but he escaped by swimming across a river, holding the letter aloft that it might not get wet. After a journey of 150 miles, he reached the French post and delivered it. On hearing it read, the people wept aloud after the manner of the Indians. Being asked what troubled them, they said they were grieving for their brother, a prisoner among the Attakapas. The Indians offered to rescue him. Ten went, all well mounted. On reaching the Attakapas village, they discharged their muskets. The savages took the report for thunder. A letter to Belle-Isle ordered him to surrender himself to his red visitors, and his hosts, terrified by the roar of musketry, did not dare to oppose his abduction. The woman whom he had served wept piteously, and it was with difficulty he tore himself from her. Bienville richly rewarded his deliverers and sent a valuable present to the Attakapas. A deputation, which, to the great delight of our hero, included his adopted mother, came to New Orleans to thank the Governor and form an alliance with the French. The Chief, pointing to the former captive, said to Bienville : " This white man, my father, is your flesh and blood, but by adoption he is one of us. His brothers died of hunger, but had they been met by my nation they would to-day be alive and free."

From that period the Attakapas always treated strangers humanely, and gradually abandoned their barbarous custom of eating human flesh.

Now it is probable that the above incidents became the occasion of sending missionaries to the friendly Attakapas. As late as 1776 Galvez, when preparing to do battle with the English, recruited among them and other tribes 160 Indian warriors. It is noted that in this campaign they refrained from doing the slightest injury to the fugitives whom they captured, and even brought the babes they found with their mothers ambushed in the woods in their arms to Galvez. But the partial suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1763, and its total suppression in 1773, deprived these intelligent barbarians of their spiritual fathers. They dwindled away, and many wholly lost the faith once delivered to them by saints.

In 1804, when Father Isabey, a holy Dominican, made his way to the " Poste des Attakapas," he suffered much hard treatment from the Indians he met on his way, remnants of the Attakapas, now entirely extinct. Among other cruelties to which they sub-

jected him was the pulling off of the nails of his fingers and toes. Francis Chauvet, who lived in a wooden hut facing the Tèche, and died there, a centenarian, not many years ago, distinctly remembered and graphically described the maimed condition of this worthy priest when rescued from these cruel savages.

IV.

But long before the granulation of cane juice, indeed before the captivity of the hapless Belle-Isle, events occurred at the other end of North America destined to give new settlers to the blooming llanos of the Attakapas. Nova Scotia (Acadie) had been peopled by Normans and Burgundians who reclaimed thousands of acres from the muddy waters of the Bay of Fundy, and lived by their daily toil in peace and plenty. They had schools, churches, priests, even musical chimes, which, thanks to our American poet, will ring out forever in song and story. By the treaty of Utrecht, 1713, Louis XIV. ceded Acadie to Queen Anne. The inhabitants were to retain their lands on swearing allegiance to the British monarch. But they refused to take any oath that could bind them to bear arms against France, and though known later as French Neutrals, their new masters refused to believe in their neutrality.

They were cajoled, deceived, lulled into a false security by vague promises, and as they held the best lands, their enemies finally decided on a wholesale spoliation. The terrible vengeance wreaked on these sturdy farmers will ever remain a shameful blot on the blurred escutcheon of England. They were accused of aiding their brethren in Canada and inciting the Indians to rebellion. And it was known that in the attack against Beauséjour some Acadians had battled under the lilies against the British flag.

On September 5, 1755, the Acadians, in response to an official mandate, assembled in their chapels to hear important details as to their future relations with the British Lion, then represented by the despicable George II. With sad amazement they perceived the handwriting that was against them. Their smiling farms were to be devastated, their houses levelled. Ships were in readiness to take them they knew not whither. The roads from the chapels to the shore were alive with men, women, and children, weeping, praying, or mournfully chanting their favorite hymn to the Sacred Heart of our Saviour. Now began their melancholy exile, "exile without an end and without an example in story."

They were scattered throughout the British Colonies from New Hampshire to Georgia, among people whose language they knew not and whose creed they abhorred. Everywhere they were regarded as "an intolerable burden," and they retained under all cir-

cumstances "an unconquerable dislike to the English."¹ Husbands and wives, parents and children, were separated. Many escaped to some French settlement. Those who remained were for the most part gradually absorbed by the population—one of many circumstances which show how the genuine Anglo-Saxon stock, if there be any such in America, has been "watered."

The army chaplains of the French detachments that came to America during the Revolution to help the patriots in their struggle against England, were often surrounded by people of Irish and Acadian lineage who had never before seen a priest.

After wandering for a decade as helots and paupers, some 600 Acadians made their way to New Orleans. Their sorrowful faces, as they drew up on the Levée and the old Place d'Armes, evoked the deepest sympathy of their compatriots in the little town over which the spotless banner still waved. The Ursulines, the only nuns from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf, received many of the women and children. The doors of every house were thrown open to the rest.

Nothing could be more different from the snug farms and smiling meadows of "Acadie, the home of the happy," than the New Orleans of that day. It was bounded rear and sides by a cypress swamp; in front was the river, ever threatening to submerge its one-story houses and palmetto huts. The population was about 3000, of whom perhaps a third were blacks; and it is certainly no slander to say that neither race was over-burdened with energy. In the centre of the town, facing the river, was the modest brick church erected in 1725, which was swept away in the terrible conflagration of 1788.

The religious state of New Orleans at this epoch was deplorable. In 1763, the Superior Council issued a decree of banishment against the Society of Jesus. From this blow the Church of Colonial Louisiana never wholly recovered. The baseness and tyranny of this insignificant body, composed almost entirely of wicked or ignorant men, are indescribable. The property of the Jesuits was confiscated and sold for 180,000 dollars. Their chapels were levelled to the ground, and the faithful in many places left without priest or altar. Among the sacrilegious wretches that aided in this infamous work, Lafrénère, of the Superior Council, stands con-

¹ During the civil war several Louisiana regiments were composed largely of "Cajuns" (Acadians), who, regarding the war as a fight against the Yankees, descendants of their ancient enemies, the English, fought furiously. Their "Cajun" battle-cries, prolonged shrieks like the war-whoop of the Indians, struck terror into the hearts of their opponents. The Unionists are charged with wreaking awful vengeance on St. Martinsville and every other haunt of the wild and vengeful Acadian.

spicuous. And his fate, and that of his confederates, a few years later, was a terrible instance of Divine retribution.¹

The Acadians found a struggle for supremacy going on between Fathers Hilaire de Génovaux² and Dagobert.³ In 1766 the Superior Council expelled the former and made the latter, who bore a most unsavory reputation, head of religion in Louisiana. The former was for some time pastor of the Attakapas, but nothing is known of his career at that "Poste" save that he kept no records, or, if he did, they were afterwards lost, as Father Barrière charitably suggests.

The mere sight of the Bourbon *fleur-de-lis* thrilled the hearts of the Acadians and kindled gleams of triumph in their sad eyes. But their joy was allayed when they learned that Louisiana was, theoretically, a Spanish province. Louis XV., like his great-grandfather, Louis XIV., grew tired of paying the expenses of a colony that brought him no return. In 1762 he ceded his broad lands below the lakes to other powers, and the parts in which we are now interested fell to Spain. But the Catholic king was in no hurry to accept the gift his royal brother had thrust upon him. And, as no representative of the majesty of Spain appeared for years, people began to imagine—the wish being father to the thought—that the transfer announced by Louis XV. to Governor Abbadie, in April, 1764, had not taken place even on paper, and that the Treaty of Cession was but a sham instrument.

Other bands of Acadians appeared on the scene. Many had tried the French West India Islands, but under torrid skies they could not live. In February, 1766, 216 Acadians were added to the population of Louisiana. The Acadian Coast, on both sides of the Mississippi, above New Orleans, was colonized by Acadians. Rations and instruments of husbandry were supplied them at the

¹ Lafrénière and four others were shot in New Orleans in 1769, for high treason. Felix del Rey, O'Reilly's lawyer, spoke of him with withering contempt as an unfaithful officer and the chief instigator of conspiracy against his king, whose money he was receiving as Attorney-General while driving his fellow-citizens to rebellion against him.

² Génovaux quarrelled with the Jesuit Vicar-General, and joined the Spanish friars against Père Dagobert. He professed to be neutral. Dagobert besought Governor Unzaga to prevent Génovaux from abusing him, "as he was in the habit of doing every day."

³ For many reasons the writer cannot believe that Dagobert was as bad as a late historian has painted him. If he were, his conduct could scarcely have escaped the eagle eye of Count O'Reilly, who lived within a few yards of him, and who would have had him removed for far less than his accusers say against him. The chief authority against him was Cyrilo, who came to supplant him, and who at that time did not understand French, and was, moreover, ignorant of the customs of Louisiana. On the arrival of the Spanish Capuchins Dagobert had been over fifty years in New Orleans and was at least seventy-four years old.

expense of the government, and many made their way to the flowery meadows of the Attakapas.

It was certainly for God and their country that some 7000 Acadians suffered the horrors of an exile unexampled in history. But the constant and bitter persecution to which they were subjected in "the house of bondage" broke their spirits in many instances; nor could they withstand that worse ordeal, intimacy with free-thinking Frenchmen. Bishop Carroll notices the deterioration of the Acadians in Baltimore. Something similar might be observed even in the remote Attakapas, and early in the next century Father Dufour informs us that only six people attended his first Mass in St. Martinsville. The vicious Frenchmen who labored with a zeal worthy of a better cause to disseminate irreligion, corrupted the Acadians wherever they were exposed to this evil influence. At an earlier epoch they became the accomplices or tools of the vile men who arrogated to themselves supreme power in Church and State before the arrival of O'Reilly. They were among the armed insurgents who paraded the streets of New Orleans, and sustained the Supreme Council when that body ordered the expulsion of Governor Ulloa, in 1768. In the report to his government of this insurrection, Ulloa charges the Acadians, with the Germans, with being guilty of ingratitude, "they having received nothing but benefits from the Spaniards."

Indeed, the inhabitants of the Attakapas received only kindness from the Spaniards. When they complained to O'Reilly, he listened gently to their grievances, and rectified them, as far as possible, on the spot. De Clouet,¹ who was commandant of the "Poste" in his time, is to-day represented by numerous descendants in the vicinity of St. Martinsville, and much information referring to these early days may be gathered from this fine family. As to the Indians, O'Reilly officially declared that it was "contrary to the mild and beneficent laws of Spain to hold them in slavery." His closest attention was given to everything regarding the divine worship. He even requested the commandant to keep the church at Natchitoches clear of dogs during divine worship. The *alcaldes* and *alguazil* or mayor, with the *escribano*, were commanded to visit all prisoners every week, and the governor several times a year. The humane and Christian regulations established in Louisiana by this great man reflect high honor on Spanish colonial legislation.

¹ Opelousas was governed from Attakapas; but in 1787, as the population had largely increased, Opelousas was made a distinct command under Nicholas Forstall, while the Attakapas remained in charge of Chevalier de Clouet. Forstall (possibly Forristal), was an Irishman, and carried with him everywhere a huge genealogical tree, which showed his descent from the Kings of Ireland. He was an upright, pious man. Many of his descendants bearing the name Forstall may yet be found in Louisiana.

V.

We have⁶ seen that the Attakapas country was peopled chiefly by Canadians and Acadians, originally of the same stock. The religious wars and other disturbances of New Orleans, the civil and ecclesiastical headquarters, found but little echo in this peaceful region. The "Poste" was seldom without a priest. There is a regular succession of pastors up to 1889. Except in administering the sacraments of baptism and matrimony, and burying the dead, the pastor had little to do for the white male portion of his congregation. Governor Unzaga says: "The men never confessed after their first communion—would think it hypocrisy to do so."¹ But they were all anxious to have the ministrations of the Church when fatal illness seized them.

The Acadians have kept distinct from the Louisiana Creoles, and have been strangely improgressive.² "My mother cooked in this manner, so shall I." "My father got along without that invention, so can I." "What was good enough for our parents will do for us." These and similar responses are given in Acadian *patois* to those who speak to them of modern improvements. They are called "Cayjuns," a corruption of "Acadians," and the Creoles rather look down on them for their peculiar habits and strange dialect. They dwell mostly in unpainted structures called *maisons d' Acadiens*, small but solidly built cottages of cypress:

"Near to the bank of the river, overshadowed by oaks from whose branches
Garlands of Spanish moss and of mystic mistletoe flaunted,
Such as the Druids cut down with golden hatchets at yule-tide,
Stood secluded and still the house of the herdsman."

The Acadians usually marry young and have large families. Among them the cradle is never empty. They are a peaceful, industrious race, strongly attached to their homes and families. Among their faults and those of the Creoles are a habit of marrying relations, and sometimes a passion for gambling, and very sad the consequences often are. Though both families fled from English tyranny in Canada and Nova Scotia, they have never been anxious to receive settlers of other races. A more liberal spirit is now beginning to prevail among the foremost inhabitants. Conservative as the Gallic races are, the railroad, immigration, and the introduction of the English language will have swept away their exclusiveness before the close of the nineteenth century.

The headquarters of Attakapas is St. Martinsville, a village of some two thousand souls. But places of equal or greater impor-

¹ Much the same is said by Cyrilo in his report to the Bishop of Santiago de Cuba. But both reports refer perhaps only to New Orleans, and are probably exaggerated.

² Several Acadians have attained eminence as lawyers and soldiers.

tance now stud that romantic region. St. Martin is no longer, as before the war, a little Paris. Its beauty even then could not have been of the architectural order, for there are no remains of any buildings save the plainest. But boundless prairies dotted with sheep and cattle, vast plantations of sugar-cane, the majestic trees that shade the bayou, endless hedges of wild roses, "the flowers that bloom in the spring" in tens of thousands, but, above all, the winding Tèche, make the parish of St. Martin "a thing of beauty and a joy forever."

The religious history of this region may be gathered from the church registers and from tradition. The inhabitants have preserved many of the peculiarities of speech and manner that characterized their ancestors, and have never lost the Faith.

The oldest register is copied from that of Pointe Coupée, a district visited by all the political and religious celebrities of early days, from O'Reilly to Peñalver. Though much worn, one can count on it eighty-two baptisms and twelve marriages from 1756 to 1773. The "Poste des Attakapas" had at first no resident priest, and the sacraments were administered there by Father Didur, of Pointe Coupée, and Friar Valentine, of Natchitoches. Register No. 1, in the archives of St. Martin, is a small folio bound in parchment, in a very dilapidated condition. Here is a copy of a note on page 1, which gives interesting details of the origin of the Church of the Attakapas:

"In Nomine J. Amen.

"This book has been made to serve as a register for Baptisms, Marriages and Burials, in the Parish of the Poste des Attakapas, beginning from 1765, Father John Francis officiating. . . . This colony belonged to France, but by the Treaty of Peace it was ceded to Spain. The Pastors that succeeded F. John Francis are Rev. Hilaire de Génovaux, French, and Rev. Joseph d'Arazena, Spaniard. No register of F. Hilary's administration can be found. We do not think he neglected to note what happened, but that his register was lost. F. d'Arazena took possession of this Parish Jan. 20, 1782. He wrote 2 small books in which baptisms, marriages, and burials, of whites and of blacks, are noted. These were left to F. Gefrotin, a Dominican, who succeeded him in 1783. Another register was found which helped to replace things in order. . . . These originals are of great use in enabling us to give correct records. . . . We beg pastors to use this and no other."

F. Marceda became pastor in 1787, F. de Deva in 1788. As a rule, priests did not remain long at this Poste. In 1791, F. de Deva was succeeded by Father George Murphy, an Irish secular priest. He labored in these parts with great zeal from 1789 to 1794, and was noted for his gifts as a preacher. He exercised the

sacred ministry in various languages, among them English, French, and Spanish. During his incumbency, we find the first mention of St. Martin as patron of the Poste des Attakapas. It was made in 1793 by his assistant, F. Pedro de Camora.¹ In the book of burials, Father Murphy speaks of the Church of St. Martin,² February 6, 1794.

After more than four years' fruitful labor, Rev. George Murphy left the humble parsonage of St. Martin.

The transfer of Louisiana to Spain was, on the whole, favorable to religion. The Catholic kings showed great zeal for the progress of the Gospel. In 1772 Father Cyrilo and four other Capuchins came to New Orleans to replace their lax French brethren, who, however, refused to be replaced. Headed by the famous Père Dagobert, they had so won the people, and prejudiced them against the Spanish clergy, that Governor Unzaga feared to remove them. Governor Miro, however, supported Cyrilo, and some semblance of order was drawn out of chaos. Cyrilo wrote very disparagingly of religion in Louisiana. "It is more difficult," said he, "to weed the garden of New Orleans than it was to plant it in the beginning."

Up to this time no bishop had visited Louisiana, and no priest had been empowered to administer confirmation. The king of Spain desired that his Louisiana subjects might receive that great sacrament, and, on his recommendation (1779), the Holy See appointed an auxiliary to the bishopric of Santiago de Cuba, who was to exercise his functions in Louisiana. The austere Cyrilo, consecrated in 1781, was chosen for this office—a choice that did not give universal satisfaction. Being really a holy and zealous man, the bishop infused new life into the country parishes, which he visited assiduously, and he was a terror to the evil-doers who have made the ecclesiastical history of the time and place so painful to the Catholic student. In 1786 he issued a pastoral, in which he eloquently urged his flock to attend Mass on Sundays and holy days, and censured the wicked custom of the negroes who, at the vesper hour every

¹ Perhaps this priest is identical with Rev. Peter de Zamora, who came to Louisiana with Sebastian O'Farrell, Marquis of Casacalvo, and received faculties from Very Rev. Thomas Hassett, April 11, 1804. Casacalvo was Governor of Louisiana, 1799-1801.

² This would indicate that Longfellow was a little premature in calling the capital of the Attakapas St. Martin. It began to be generally so called only in the beginning of the present century. Over the high altar of the church is an old painting of St. Martin dividing his cloak with a beggar.

Le Sieur Louis Charles de Blanc, captain in the armies of the king of Spain, was civil and military commandant of the Poste des Attakapas in 1800. The writer thinks that he is the first commandant of whom it is recorded that he resided at St. Martinsville. His descendants are numerous about the old Poste.

Sunday, assembled in a green, still called Congo Square, to dance the bamboula and throw the wanga, and worship the serpent with hideous rites imported from Africa by the Yolofs, Foulahs, Bambaras, Mandingoes and other races of the dark continent.

While changes went on at headquarters, the Church of the Attakapas, save for the appointment or confirming of a pastor, seems to have been left severely alone. There is no record, so far as we can ascertain, that the zealous Bishop Cyrilo ever evangelized "the black, white, and brown" dwellers on these "sultry savannahs." He visited many other country churches, as is evident from the registers, which he caused to be kept in Spanish, not in French as heretofore. The many Irish clergy scattered throughout the territory over which this prelate held spiritual sway,—Fathers Burke, Walsh, White, Hassett, O'Reilly, Crosby, Barry, Savage, McKenna, etc.,—who had been accustomed to make these entries in Latin, are commanded to keep their books henceforth in Spanish. But no order of this nature is recorded in the Attakapas register till March 26, 1796.

The reward which so often comes to the zealous and saintly in this life overtook Bishop Cyrilo in the midst of his labors for souls. He was suspended by the king,¹ and commanded to return to his province, Catalonia. A long letter, dated November 23, 1793, from Charles IV., signed *Yo el Rey*, gave him this unwelcome news, and in 1794 he left Louisiana forever. He was delayed at Havana for want of means to take him to Spain in compliance with the royal ukase, and was still in that city in 1799, the incumbent of Havana refusing to pay his salary till the king interfered. Well might this holy man, persecuted by his brethren, his king, and the abandoned souls for whom he toiled, exclaim: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in a strange land."

On October 19, 1796, the "Poste des Attakapas" saw a bishop for the first time. On the 26th of March, the pastor, styled by Bishop Peñalver "Don Miguel Bernardo de Barrière," made the first Spanish entry in his register, probably because he had on that day received official notice of the coming of his bishop. This visitation is the only one made during the Spanish domination.

In the bull which makes New Orleans the see of a diocese bounded north and east by the diocese of Baltimore, and south and west by Linares and Durango, Pius VI. gives as his reason for forming Louisiana and Florida into a separate diocese "the miserable state of religion and ecclesiastical discipline" in these parts.

¹ The King of Spain as "Protector of the Council of Trent" assumed great authority in Church matters.

Don Luis Peñalver y Cardenas¹, having been the right hand of the bishop at Havana, was well aware of the deplorable condition of the diocese confided to his pastoral care. His coming was hailed with delight by the Governor, Baron Carondelet, who had reported adversely on Church matters in his province, and seen with grief the unsuccessful efforts of Cyrilo to correct abuses. The bishop's instructions to his clergy show that he was filled with the spirit of God and an ardent zeal for souls. From the St. Martinsville register, "Parroquia de San Martin des *Atacapas*," we gather that he made a careful examination of all the records that could be found, noted their defects, and put them in the best order possible. The great distinction always kept up in Louisiana between people of unmixed European origin and the other races, is apparent from these records, as the "whites, the blacks, and the browns" are entered separately in the lists of baptisms, marriages, and burials. As in New Orleans and other parts of Louisiana, there were in the Attakapas negroes, Indians, Mestizos (children of the white and the Indian), griffe (of the African and the Indian), mulatto, mulatre, mulatress (of the white and black). These mixed races the bishop calls *browns*, *morenos*. Later, however, cognizance was taken but of two classes: the whites, Europeans and their descendants, and the colored.²

Bishop Peñalver's entry in the *Atacapas* register is signed simply: "El Obispo de la Luisiana."

The bishop did not forget the *Atacapas*. Three years later he speaks of that district as one into which evil men had penetrated—adventurers who "have no religion, acknowledge no God, and have deteriorated the morals of the people."

Louisiana was soon to lose this zealous prelate. In 1801 he was made Archbishop of Guatemala. The diocese was now governed by Canon Thomas Hassett, head of the Cathedral chapter, with whom was associated Very Rev. Patrick Walsh. These worthy and learned Irish priests, who had labored long in the diocese and were most useful in a cosmopolitan city as speaking several European languages, were not destined to live many years

¹ According to Spanish custom, he bore his mother's name as well as his father's. His parents were Don Diego Peñalver and Doña Maria Luisa de Cardenas.

² To evade O'Reilly's merciful law which forbade the enslaving of Indians, these poor people were often classed with the mulattoes as colored.

The Spaniards were most kind to the Indians. In May, 1784, Indian congresses were held with great pomp at Pensacola and Mobile, at which Count Arthur O'Neil and Governor Miro presided. Of the treaty framed on that occasion, here is an article: "In conformity with the humane and generous sentiments of the Spanish nation, we (the Indians) renounce forever the custom of raising scalps, and making slaves of our white captives," etc.

under the American flag.¹ Fr. Hassett, whose health was broken by the severity of his apostolic labors in a climate which had never agreed with him, died suddenly in April, 1804. The closing years of Father Walsh were embittered by the frequent rebellions of Fray Antonio Sedilla. After an illness of five days, possibly yellow fever, the administrator died August 22, 1806. Posthumous honors of every description were lavished on a priest who had during life won the respect of friend and foe. Father Walsh's official title was: "Vicar-General and Governor *ad interim* of the diocese." His remains lie beneath the sanctuary of the old Ursuline chapel. The cathedral being under an interdict, in consequence of the usurpation of Sedilla, this was the only place in the city in which Mass could be offered or the sacraments administered. Besides, Father Walsh was a benefactor of the Ursuline community.

VI.

The French in Louisiana have been singularly barren of vocations to the priesthood. The first century and a half produced one, the learned Father Viel. The bishops of Louisiana have always been natives of other countries. In the diocese of New Orleans to-day there are among the secular clergy only two priests of Creole parentage. Several youths of that race have, however, joined the Jesuits and other religious bodies. In 1794 Father Viel became seventh pastor of Attakapas, or rather exercised his priestly functions there when required, for, we regret to say, he is marked in the register, "Not approved." A writer of distinguished ability, he consoled himself in the troubles of life by devoting his leisure hours to the muses. Though "not approved," probably because he had been a Jesuit, he is known traditionally as an excellent priest. The distinguished men whom he had educated comforted his old age by their filial attentions, and published a magnificent edition of his works.

F. de Barrière, an *émigré*, eighth pastor of this "Poste," arrived²

¹ Fray Antonio Sedilla, known traditionally as Père Antoine, came to New Orleans in Governor Miro's time, to introduce the Inquisition; but Miro shipped him back to Spain at once. He returned and ingratiated himself with the people, who supported him in his rebellions against Administrator Walsh and Bishop Dubourg. The stories of his immorality the writer cannot believe. He lived forty years in New Orleans, baptized and married almost everybody. His closing years were edifying. He went barefoot, wore a coarse brown habit, and a rope as his girdle. It is said he received from the people 30 to 40 thousand dollars a year, and gave all to the poor. He lived in a hovel behind the Cathedral. Several persons still living knew him well. One describes him as a prodigy of ignorance, not able even to speak or write his own language correctly, and, as a director, very easy. He died in 1829. The Legislature adjourned to attend his funeral.

² F. de Barrière lived about a mile from the village, but walked in every day to say

March 8, 1795, and remained till 1804. His name occurs from time to time till 1830, and is also found in the register of Opelousas and Lafayette, where he was pastor successively. He returned to France and died in his native city, Bordeaux.

As time wore on, the early settlers were joined by friends and relatives, and it was decided to build a village. A surveyor, named Johnson, drew the plan, but the progress was slow. The houses were very plain, and did not extend further than what is now Main street. The oldest inhabitants of a few years ago remembered the last years and death of the centenarian, François Chauvet, who lived near the bayou. When he arrived at the "Poste," Main street was part of a vast prairie. He worshiped in the first chapel, a small frame building, memorable, says tradition, for the visit of Evangeline. The poor presbytery was said, in 1795, to be the oldest house in the village. That the church was built in 1770 may be inferred from the fact that it was at that period Mr. d'Hauterive gave the land the church and its dependencies now occupy, and on which a large part of the town is built. From this donation arises the obligation of many property holders to pay rent to the church. It must be remembered that during the Spanish domination the inhabitants paid no taxes. The clergymen were liberally paid by the king of Spain, who even furnished necessities for the church. Spanish galleons brought their hundreds of thousands of solid money from Mexico to Louisiana every year to pay the expenses of Church and State.

From 1802 to 1840, 2198 baptisms of blacks are registered. Up to 1887 there are recorded in the archives of St. Martin 19,692 baptisms, 3527 marriages and 7227 burials.

F. Gabriel Isabey exercised the ministry at St. Martinsville from 1804 till his death, of heart disease, July 21, 1823. During his administration the ecclesiastical extension of the parish was divided. This priest was greatly beloved. He had a pleasant face, was tall, well proportioned,¹ and possessed of elegant manners. His gentleness and amiability gained all hearts, and when he died there was general mourning. He owned a plantation, of which his nephew, Mark, took care. Little children were greatly attached to him. A venerable lady tells that when she was four or five years old, she went to his door, and calling his old servant, Sylvain, by his pet name, said: "Vain-vain, where is Isabey?" The good priest came out and gave her cakes and candy. The memories of childhood are never forgotten, and to her latest breath she recalled this incident with pleasure. Vain-vain could not survive his

Mass. The church was small and poor. On Sundays he remained about the church all day.

¹ The writer has a miniature of Father Isabey which bears out this description.

master. He ran through the village, exclaiming in his picturesque jargon: *Maite mouri, Négue mouri*. His intense grief deprived him of the little sense he once had. He bought a loaf and got a bottle of water, and laid them on Père Isabey's grave: "Cé pour *vouyage là*," said he. He wandered in the wood, which at that time surrounded the church, striking his head against the trees and crying out: *Maite mouri, Négue mouri*. A few days later the body of the poor Congo was found floating on the Tèche.

Even the animals loved this good man. After his funeral his favorite cat disappeared, and every one was asking: "Where is Père Isabey's cat?" But the poor animal was soon forgotten. Years after, when the church was about to be enlarged, the whole village assembled to see the remains of F. Isabey exhumed. The skeleton of the cat was found at the foot of his coffin.

Father Borella, an Italian, came to St. Martin at the age of fifty, August 20, 1819. He was pastor of the parish from the death of F. Isabey till his own, January 21, 1836. He left \$16,000 to enlarge the church. His grave in the cemetery being neglected, his remains were removed to the church, where they now repose.

In 1826 and 1827 multitudes of Congo negroes used to assemble every Sunday on the green before the church and dance under the trees. This gave no small annoyance to the pastor, the dances being part of the hideous rites with which these benighted people worshipped their idols. But gradually they became Christians, and the horrible ceremonies entirely disappeared.

Under the administration of Father Borella the parish was again divided. Of Father Brasseur, who succeeded him, 1830 to 1840, no traditions seem to have been preserved. The same may be said of F. de St. Aubin, 1840 to 1841. In 1842 the fourteenth pastor, Father Martin, arrived. He was seventy years old, and soon became paralyzed, except as to his tongue. A priest, aged thirty, F. Bérel, assisted. This poor young man became very ill, and a charitable woman took care of him. One day she left him in charge of a colored servant, and coming in the evening to see how he fared, she found him alone and dying. She raised his head on her arm, and he cried out: "A little water, for the love of God." But before she had time to assuage his thirst, he was dead. Father Lucas was curate from 1843 to 1845.

Father Dufour, fifteenth pastor, had a very pleasing countenance, and despite a frankness that sometimes gave offence to those he reproved, was generally beloved. He had a great gift of eloquence. The first Sunday he officiated only six persons were present at Mass. Yet he preached a most powerful sermon. His auditors spread his fame as an eloquent speaker, and the second Sunday eighty came to Mass. The church was soon too small for

the congregation. But this brilliant man could not long content himself in such a Sleepy Hollow. He left on April 29, 1848, deeply regretted. The ancients still speak of him with admiration and affection. Of his successor, J. Jacques Fontbonne, no details have reached us.

About this period the shrill whistle of the steamboat was heard for the first time on the Tèche. *Le Correo*, Captain Curry, began to ply regularly between New Orleans and St. Martinsville. The inhabitants built a beautiful steamer which they called "Attakapas." The captain belonged to a family well-known in these regions, Delahoussaye. Every arrival of this handsome "grayhound" of the river was announced by a volley of musketry.

VII.

The seventeenth pastor, Ange Marie Felix Jan, was born at Pontivy, April 11, 1802. The official record of his birth is dated: "Le vingt et un Germinal de l'an dixième de la République Française, une et indivisible." He was baptized stealthily in a hospital. Becoming an orphan at a tender age, he was placed by his godfather and guardian, Ange Marie Chassin, at the Jesuit College of Ste. Anne d' Auray, where he remained seven years. A letter from the president, which the old priest carefully preserved, bears high testimony to his literary ability and good conduct, and describes his life as most Christian and edifying. He desired to become a Jesuit, but his guardian opposed him, and he entered the Sulpitian College at Paris, in 1823. In 1826 he finished his philosophy and theology, and was ordained in May, 1826. The ceremonies began at 6 A.M. and were not over till 2 P.M. Père Jan always spoke with enthusiasm of Archbishop de Quélen. "Ah," he would say, "Monseigneur was not handsome, but what dignity, what nobility in his demeanor, especially when he officiated! And with what fervor and piety he celebrated Mass!"

The young priest made a series of resolutions which are those of a saintly soul, and to which he adhered to the end of his long life. Love of the Blessed Virgin was almost a passion with him. From childhood he recited his rosary every day.

His first charge was to teach the catechism classes for four hours a day. He was so devoted to this duty that, even as an old man, he loved to recall this period, and spoke of it as the happiest of his life. He was exceedingly modest, and it was but rarely he raised a little the veil which covered his life in France. Thé superb ceremonies that celebrated the coronation of Charles X. were never effaced from his memory. The grand tableau made by the princes, cardinals, ambassadors, and all the great orders of the state, gratified his natural love of the beautiful; "but," he would say when

describing the scene, "the most imposing figure there was Monseigneur de Quélen."

Père Jan, like the other members of his family, was a royalist. In this he never changed, and towards the close of his life showed the deepest feeling at the death of the Count de Chambord. He related that when that prince was only five years old, he and other seminarians met him with the Duchess de Guyon in the gardens of the Tuilleries. The Duchess asked the young people if they would like to see the prince. "Oh, yes, Madame la Duchesse, we should be most happy," was the reply. But princes of five are happily like other children of the same age, and the royal child, intimidated by the crowd of young men, hid his face in his hands. But in a moment he recovered the self-possession taught him from the cradle; and when the lady said: "Salute these gentlemen, Monseigneur," the charming child advanced most graciously and murmured in his sweet voice, "good morning, gentlemen." The seminarians gave a hearty cheer for the Count de Chambord.

A second time Père Jan sought to enter the Society of Jesus, but his confessor said: "No; go back to Brittany." He obeyed, simply, and we next hear of him as curate of the Cathedral of Vannes. Here, as everywhere else, he won golden opinions, and we have the written testimony of the senior canon as to the great sanctity of his life and his zeal for souls. Equally fruitful in virtue was his sojourn at Nantes, as the bishop and clergy of that city bore witness.¹

Among his penitents at Nantes was a Carmelite nun, Madame Fidelis, who escaped the massacre of '92, and sought refuge first with her family, who were rich, and then in Spain. When the evil days were over, she returned, hoping to gain admittance to some cloister. In Spain she had endured all sorts of privations, and lost her health, she said, by the heat of the Spanish sun. She rented a little room near the cathedral, and never left it but at day-break to hear Mass. The rest of the day it was carefully barricaded. She was nearly ninety, and very delicate. Père Jan often visited her. One day he found her very sad. "I have suffered agonies," said she, "because my servant, being angry with me, opened the doors and windows and let in the sun's rays." And she wept bitterly. The young priest consoled her and promised to come every morning to see that the sun was not allowed to molest her. In gratitude she gave him a beautiful gold cross of ancient workmanship, which a few years before his death he presented to the

¹ Père Jan preserved the letters received from the ecclesiastical authorities under whom he had worked, probably because he did not wish to be identified with such of his clerical countrymen as had come to Louisiana without being sent or invited and without the proper credentials.

writer of this article. He established a foundation Mass to be said every feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel for poor Madame Fidelis after her happy death, and always offered Mass for her soul on the 16th of July.

Seven Visitation nuns who had been driven from their monastery came to Nantes; Père Jan gave them a house, and found them means to live in community. Their superior, whom he highly esteemed, gave him a curious silver cross that had belonged to one of the first Visitation mothers. This relic he bestowed a few years ago on the Convent of Mercy, St. Martinsville. Among these Visitandines was "une Janseniste," whom he could not convert, and who, to his great grief, died as she had lived.

Père Jan was placed over the *Young Workmen* at Rouen in 1838, and made *aumonier* of the Hotel Dieu a little later. Desiring to participate in the good works of the Trappists, he was aggregated to them in 1842. In 1848 he was sent as missionary apostolic to Hayti, and his adventures in that isle, where he at first gained the good will of the terrible Soulouque, would fill a volume. Having received from this worthy himself a peremptory order to quit, he put himself under the protection of the French consul. But he was obliged to leave, and on returning to France, in May, 1849, after visiting Nantes and Paris, he spent some time in the Château de la Motte with his devoted friend, Madame la Marquise de St. Léonard, partly, it is said, to escape the mitre, and partly to mature his plans for devoting himself to the foreign mission, for which he had always had a great desire. In January, 1851, he presented himself to Archbishop Blanc, who had invited him, and was just then in need of a pastor for St. Martinsville. He merely passed through New Orleans and never returned, devoting himself to the welfare of his people with an energy that never relaxed. He never left his post even for a day, never left his house save for the church, the schools, or the sick. He was a priest for over sixty years, during which his daily Mass was omitted only three times. Tobacco he never touched, save a little in the form of snuff, and he was a total abstainer. When not among the sick or in the schools, he almost lived in the confessional.¹ Money he never mentioned. If some were given him, it merely touched his hand for a blessing, and then went to the poor, especially those who had known better days—a numerous class in Louisiana since the Civil War. The annuity that came to him from his patrimony in France went the same way. That he might be better able to help the

¹ This was especially the case at Easter-tide. Père Jan was in the confessional at daybreak. About 7 o'clock he left it to say Mass. After his thanksgiving he returned. After each confession—in case of persons who lived at a distance—he would give the absolved penitent holy communion. He seldom broke his fast until after 3 P.M.

needy, his dress and food and sleeping-room were those of a pauper. Though he lived on corn meal and milk, his constitution was wonderfully strong. He walked bare-headed at every funeral, taking no notice of rain, mire, or sunshine. He attended sick calls many miles away, and after riding over the prairies almost all night, would be at the altar next morning. If he were delayed, he would say Mass at any hour, going directly to the church on his return, and ringing the bells to give notice to his flock. His curious little buggy might often be seen flying over the prairies, for he always kept a fleet horse. But he was often obliged to go on foot where his horse could not carry him. Two days before he died he spent the night searching for a poor colored man that asked for his ministrations. The weather had been very wet. The prairie verdure was hidden in many places by muddy water. His steed, which the boys used to call "the lightning flash," could not "pull through" the mud, but the old man did. Leaving his turnout in a quagmire, he half waded, half dragged himself through the obstructions—and the writer is inclined to think that anybody who has not been in St. Martinsville in a rainy season knows not what mud is—he reached home coated with dirt and wet to the skin, and, after such a night, was on the altar in less than fifteen minutes.

In March, 1881, Père Jan founded St. Martin's Convent of Mercy, whose astonishing success he often declared to be the chief consolation of his old age. This was in a great measure due to his incessant exertions in its behalf, and the Sisters of Mercy mourned him as their kind father and best benefactor. They were glad to be able to ease him a little on their arrival by taking charge of the First Communion and Confirmation classes which, including "white, black and brown," numbered thousands, and with which he had never had help before.

When the bells, even those of the neighboring Protestant churches, announced the sad news of the death of this patriarch, the whole village mourned, business was suspended until after the funeral, stores and offices closed. While his remains lay in the church, hundreds touched them with beads and medals to preserve as relics. People spoke of miracles wrought by contact with his precious earthly tegument. And a hardened sinner who had publicly defied God and man, no sooner gazed on his sacred remains than he wept, and said: "I will make my peace with God as soon as a priest comes for the funeral."

A solemn *Requiem* was offered for him on August 17th, and his remains were laid beneath the sanctuary from which he had blessed and instructed his people for nearly forty years. The voice of the people proclaimed him a saint, and he certainly led the life of one

among them—a life of prayer, penance and labor. He was a man of splendid education and brilliant intellectual gifts, yet, for the love of God, he chose to wear out his life among poor Cayjuns and negroes. He had no congenial society; few, if any, of his parishioners were his equals intellectually. In manners he was a perfect gentleman, and was as courteous and gentle with the humblest of his flock as with the highest in the land. He had a remarkably strong countenance and a wealth of hair white as cotton bursting from the pod. He seldom wore a hat—the one he had was half as old as himself; his cassock was brown and threadbare; but though his plump figure was draped with an Indian blanket, it could not hide his distinguished air; the culture derived from the polished society in which the first half of his life was mostly spent remained to the last. And, however awed people were by his undoubted sanctity and his perfect devotion to “mankind of every description,” especially the lowliest, the universal verdict was, “Père Jan is a gentleman—a real gentleman.” And this from aristocrats of his flock who, while admitting that the king can make noblemen, declare that “it takes three hundred years to make a gentleman.”

Save for God and his work, the loneliness of Père Jan's later years would have been terrible. His early friends, Lacordaire, Barat, Varin, and so many others, had all passed away. One of his pupils, the aged Bishop de Goesbriand, still survives. But they never met in America. How often must the old priest, amid the vast solitudes over which he roved alone under the midnight moon, in search of souls, fearless of the evil men¹ or beasts that infested them—how often must nature have sighed “for the touch of a vanished hand,” and, still more, for “the sound of a voice that is still?” Or, rather, were not sufferings and privations joyous things to him who had borne the yoke of the Lord from his youth? Did he not realize a thousand-fold the truth of the beautiful promise: “Son, give me thy youth and I will guard thy old age?” Was he not able to say with the spouse in the Canticles: “All things, my beloved, the old and the new, I have kept for thee.” No regret clouded the green and beautiful old age of this holy man. He

¹ Père Jan was utterly fearless in every way. On his first coming to St. Martinsville, his great devotedness to the colored, bound and free, was not relished by some of his aristocratic white parishioners. He told the writer that on several occasions men stood up in the church and drove their slaves from the Communion rail. They had evidently intimidated some of his predecessors. But Père Jan soon showed these people, whose gentlemanly propensities had been maturing for centuries, that the poorest slave was as much to him as the highest magnate, for it was only for the immortal soul he cared in each. They thought that negroes should not be allowed to kneel at the same railing as they, but Père Jan was no respecter of persons.

had given the whole substance of his house for love, and despised it all as nothing.

VIII.

Hitherto we have given sober history, but we cannot wholly forget that poetry and romance have cast their bewildering spells over the Attakapas. It is alive with weird and fantastic legends of the man-eating Indians, the early missions, and that beauteous flower of Acadie, *Evangeline*. For long stretches the solitude of the Tèche, whose meandering course lies through "the green Opelousas" and the fertile fields of St. Martin, is as unbroken as when her bark navigated its sluggish waters. It is spanned by arches of live oak and cypress, whose dark, thick foliage, draped with Spanish moss, gives the whole a melancholy yet most poetic aspect. The noise of engine and paddles seems strangely discordant on the silent river. The echoes of the "Canadian boat songs" of the men "who rowed through the midnight, silent at times," come down to us through the misty avenues of time. The trills and roulades of the mocking bird make the morning joyous. There is little undergrowth between the heavy trunks; but one frequently catches delicious vistas of the bright green and golden yellow of the cultivated fields beyond. Down to the water's edge grassy slopes in many places roll in graceful curves, and from out the cool shadows of numberless groves comes the sweetest forest music.

Towards St. Martinsville a sweep round a point of live oaks, "bearded like a pard," brought the boat to "*Evangeline's Bend*." The immortal trees that sheltered the cannibals and waved their branches to welcome the sad exiles of Acadie, lean lovingly over the bayou and embrace each other in the skies. One seems to be in a gorgeous cathedral, whose roof is interminable. The whispering winds, the dim religious light, the preternatural calm of these scenes, fresh from the hand of God, make this summer-land of intense sunshine and cool shadow and quivering moonlight glorious "beyond the muse's painting."

Around the oldest town on the Tèche poetry and romance will linger as long as our gentle troubadour's *Evangeline* survives, whether we regard that maiden as a beautiful creation of fiction, or, according to the traditions of these parts, a genuine heroine who lived, loved, and suffered, and, like the sweet-smelling balms of the east, gave out her fragrance only when her heart was broken. Upon the details of the heartless eviction of her people romance has lovingly seized and the poet has turned the magic light of his genius, till the gilded halo of song and story veils, as with a beauteous haze, the harsh outlines of sombre historic truth. *Evangeline*, with Father Felician, began her search for Gabriel, the silent

hero of the tale. They accompanied a band of exiles down the Mississippi, passed the Golden Coast, and entered Bayou Plaquemine. Her heart told her that

“Through these shadowy aisles had Gabriel wandered before her.”

Tradition asserts that their meeting with Basil, the blacksmith, took place at St. Martinsville. In the first church¹ erected here she heard Father Felician's Mass ere she set out again on her sorrowful quest. In front of it was the *plaza* or square, still unfenced, and, save for a bronze statue of Père Jan,² unadorned, as when her dark eyes looked their last upon it. Around the church was the parish cemetery. Several graves and ruined tombs may still be seen to the right, though since the opening of a new cemetery—now an old one—no interments have been made near the church.

Our first glimpse of St. Martinsville was idyllic. The evening was of perfect clearness; the sun was setting slowly, and the young moon rising as we passed the old-fashioned draw-bridge, and moved upon the shiny waters beneath the shadows of hoary trees, garlanded with wreaths of gray moss. The repose of the scene was preternatural. Save the lowing of the Attakapas kine on the distant prairie, and the tinkling of the sheep-bells, no sound broke the solemn stillness. The white spire of the old church on its red base stood out finely against the darkening sky, the cross, which has stood aloft in this place for nearly a century and a half, keeping loving watch over all. It was high water, and everything on the banks was mirrored in the clear depths. We sang softly the Acadian hymn to the Sacred Heart of our Saviour. And the writer pledged herself to return to these fairy scenes by dipping her hand in the Tèche and tasting of its waters. For whoever drinks of these waters must revisit its umbrageous shores; yea, as a sterner proverb hath it, must return thither to die.

The cloisters of a Carthusian monastery are not more silent than St. Martinsville. A thriving outpost when most of the great cities of our country were not, it seems now, in the serene evening of life, dozing over the bright memories of the past. The broad dusty thoroughfares felt scarcely a footfall. The stores were open, but no one was in them. Around a strongly built brick church the town lies. The architecture is of a past era. Cottages shingle-roofed and bricked between the uprights, close Creole doors and shutters, an occasional tile roof—it was like stepping into the Attakapas capital some eighty years ago. On Sunday this other village of

¹ The old people say this church was afterwards burned.

² This statue was erected by the exertions of Père Jan's successor, Rev. A. B. Langlois, who, besides being an excellent priest, is an accomplished botanist.

Grand Pré shook off its slumberous spirit, and the charming mist of poesy seemed to evaporate. Hundreds of carriages arrive from all points of the prairie, pirogues anchor in the bayou, cavalcades of horsemen on Creole tackies come tramping in from the various roads in clouds of yellow dust, processions of bright-eyed children wind out of the convent gardens, and by 10 o'clock the spacious church is full of "white, black, and brown," summoned by the sweet-sounding quintette of bells of which the old place is proud. Mass does not begin directly. Père Jan is hearing confessions. About 11 High Mass begins. The choir is good, but the best voice in the village belongs to the saintly octogenarian.

No non-Catholic place of worship stands within the limits of St. Martinsville. It is, to a great extent, French in race and feeling, though not without Fitzgeralds, O'Rorkes and other names of Celtic origin, who, however, have long since been thoroughly Gallicized. New settlers have come with the railroad, and every one now speaks English. The women have discarded the Spanish mantilla, universal when the writer first knew St. Martinsville, and taken to modern millinery.

But nothing can rob the old place of the glamour of poesy that envelops it. Within the convent square is Evangeline's tree, a giant oak, from whose shade "the maiden descended down to the river's brink, where the boatmen were already waiting." Sometimes in the cool of even', when the moon is growing old, *on dit*, a slight figure with sad eyes and streaming hair is seen gliding among the shadows of this oak and among the ruined tombs of the ancient cemetery by the tall, red church. And the children hurry past these haunted spots with terror in their wide, dark eyes; even at noon, they say: "Perhaps Evangeline is under the convent oak, for she, too, was a Sister of Mercy." And, verily, when the moonbeams assume fantastic shapes, flitting among its shadows, imagination may easily create for us once more that fair girl, all in flowing white, her soft, black eyes gleaming through her nut-brown hair; and with true poetic feeling cordially would we welcome such a ghost. "Faded was she and old," says the poet, "when in disappointment her long journey ended." But never is Evangeline faded or old to us. To us she is always beautiful, and young, and "fair to behold, that maiden of seventeen summers." We see her in the summer of All Saints, "the sunshine of St. Eulalie," where "the simple Acadian farmers dwelt in the love of God and man." We see her on the flowery surf of the Attakapas prairie, now dotted with substantial plantation homes, and huge sugar-houses. We see her when the dying

"Looked up into her face, and thought, indeed, to behold there
Gleams of celestial light encircle her forehead with splendor."

We see her as a fair wraith ascending from her northern grave and revisiting the land of the cypress and myrtle.

And to this one fair spirit, so thoroughly Catholic, and so touchingly described in the exquisite imagery of the poet, more than to any belted knight or squire, the Church of the Attakapas owes the dreamy mist of poesy that floats about her groves and waters, and the halo that gleams from the oldest temple of God on the Attakapas prairies.

THE CONVERSION OF THE NORTHMEN.

IN the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW for April, 1888, we gave an account of the discoveries and colonies of the Northmen in the Western Hemisphere, commencing with the close of the tenth century; and we hinted at the influence these events had exerted upon the subsequent discovery of America by Columbus. As a fitting sequel we now propose to give the early religious and ecclesiastical history of these Northmen, and, in the near future, of the Norse Church on our continent during the same period. Our data are chiefly derived from the ancient Icelandic literature; but as much of the account is deduced from Papal Bulls, briefs, letters, and other Roman sources, may we not express the hope that this interesting subject, treated herein now for the first time as a separate and distinct study, may lead to a more thorough and complete elucidation of so attractive and important a branch of ecclesiastical history? We feel the more encouraged to express this hope here, since that illustrious Pope, scholar and author, who so gloriously and so ably fills the Papal chair, Leo XIII., has opened the treasures of the Vatican to the researches of the students, historians, scholars, and antiquarians of the world. There were two spots on the earth that held intercourse for five centuries with the distant and struggling colonies and Church of Greenland and Vinland. One of these was the frozen island, whose intrepid sons, the Vikings of Iceland, reached our shores in the tenth century, and planted there a commonwealth and a Christian Church; the other was Rome, mother of nations and of churches, whose Pontiffs provided that most distant and forlorn portion of the Universal Church with a succession of seventeen bishops, and when overwhelmed with disaster struggled to revive the Church and episcopate of Green-

land. It is to the former that we are indebted for that rich and beautiful Icelandic literature which first gave the modern world the earliest and authentic accounts of the voyages, the discoveries, the colonies, and the heroic deeds of the Northmen in America. Thus, from the traditional histories and epics of the Saga-men and Scalds of Iceland, subsequently reduced to writing by the monks of the frozen island, the *Ultima Thule* of the ancients, collected together, carefully compiled, and handsomely published by the Royal Society of Northern Antiquarians, by the labors of the European Societies of Americanists, and other learned bodies, aided by the governments of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, we have received accessions to the history of our race of the rarest, most instructive, reliable and authentic character. So, too, we must also turn to the Roman archives, to the treasures of the Vatican, now so generously made accessible to the world by Pope Leo XIII., for the details of the ecclesiastical history of the Northmen in America, so far as the same may be contained in Papal bulls, briefs, and letters, and in the reports and relations of the bishops and missionaries who took part in the conversion of the barbarians of the north of Europe, and in forming their missions, churches, and episcopal sees. There is one subject more especially, now most imperfectly explored and involved in doubt and confusion, which is the episcopate of the western hemisphere, involving the exact names of the seventeen or eighteen bishops, the dates of their appointments, the exact order of succession, their history and services to the cause of Christianity, what reports they made to Rome, when and where and by whom consecrated, their deaths and burials, and the churches which they founded. Of Bishop Eric, the first bishop, the one who is said to have come to America and preached the Gospel, and sealed his preaching with his blood among the aborigines of our country, the least is known. Of the others, we can approximate to the order of succession and other particulars; but we possess no detailed or complete history in respect to most of them. It is not improbable that Eric, the first, may not have been the only Greenland bishop to visit our country and announce the glad tidings to the "Skraelings" of his day. The Roman archives would certainly go far to clear up our doubts and to supply the deficiencies in our earliest ecclesiastical history.

The Northmen were an ancient Asiatic tribe, and it is probable, according to Tacitus among ancient authors, and M. Mallet among moderns, that they, as all the ancient tribes and clans into which mankind were dispersed after the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel, originally worshipped the one true God. It is thought by learned antiquarians that they worshipped God chiefly and were free from polytheism; even after they had defeated the

French under Rollo, and had under that same general conquered Norway, they preserved traces of this *cultus* in the midst of their paganism. Their more immediate origin was Gothic. The religion and ceremonies of the Scandinavians was peculiar to themselves; and throughout the degeneration and corruptions of their mythology preserved some traces of their former worship of the true God, and their religion always bore some resemblance to Christianity. The doctrine of future responsibility was preserved by them, and they believed in future rewards and punishments. At first and in the abyss of ages, according to their pagan mythology, all things were chaotic, and without form or life, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; but by the operation of the warmth upon the chaotic mass the giant Ymer sprang forth into life. Then Odin, who is believed to have been originally a true historical personage when divested of his subsequent mythical character, having come from Asgard on the river Don (Tanais), in southern Russia, slew Ymer and his entire offspring; the bad and evil Jetters and Thyrsers (giants) were drowned in the stream of blood that proceeded from the corpse of the murdered Ymer, except one giant who propagated the evil generation of Jetters or Thyrsers, and lived in perpetual enmity with gods and men. Odin then became the supreme deity. Of Ymer's body, as related by the old Scandinavian *Sagas*, Odin moulded and framed the ordained and settled world with mountains, rivers, lakes, trees, and clouds, and the skull of Ymer formed the vault of heaven, and therein he placed the celestial luminaries of the great ash-tree, Yggdrasill, whose topmost branches were said to dance eternally in the heavenly light; he formed the first human beings, Arkur and Embla, who resided in Midgard, and from whom are descended the whole human race. The gods themselves lived in Asgard, close to Upsala, in Sweden. Odin was superior to all other gods, and it was his wife and children that formed the inferior yet powerful deities of the universe. He was the father of gods and men, and ruled the world by his wisdom and prudence, contemplating and viewing all things from his heavenly seat and royal palace in the Valhalla of the Scandinavians, the Hlidskjalf. Yet he was a fearful and remorseless god, and of him it was written, "the terrible and severe god; the father of slaughter; he who giveth victory and reviveth courage in the conflict; who nameth those that are to be slain." Warriors going into battle made a vow to send a certain number of souls, which they consecrated to him; they were his right; he received them at Valhalla, his ordinary place of residence, where he rewarded all such as died sword in hand, and admitted them to sit and feast at his sumptuous table. Odin even descended at times, and mingled in earthly battles.

He inflamed the fury of the combatants, he struck those that were destined to perish, and carried their souls to his celestial abode. The principal goddess among the Scandinavians was Frigga, the wife of Odin, who seems to correspond with the goddess Earth of the Greeks, Romans and Phœnicians. The prose and verse *Eddas*, the ancient Scandinavian account of their mythology, say that Frigga was a most benign goddess, and yet she went to war as well as Odin, and divided with him the souls of the slain. She was also the goddess of pleasure; and although the Scandinavian deities abstained from the loves of the Greek and Roman gods, she is supposed to have occupied the same position in heaven that Venus did with the more cultivated, though less virtuous, nations of the earth. The second principal god was Thor, who was a son of Odin, and the most valiant of his sons, the defender and avenger of the gods, and the destroyer of giants and monsters, their enemies. He became more especially the favorite deity of Norway, where he received many of the attributes of Odin, became the god of war for that country, and was most ardently worshipped by the warlike Northmen. His mallet or hammer was his favorite weapon, with which he struck dead his enemies; as often as he discharged it, it returned to his hand, which held it with iron gauntlets, and it had the power of renewing and imparting to him a godlike strength. The Danes especially paid the highest honors to Odin; the inhabitants of Norway and Iceland appear to have been under the immediate protection of Thor, and the Swedes had chosen for their titular deity Kreyja, or rather Trey, who, according to the *Edda*, presided over the seasons of the year, and bestowed peace, fertility and riches. There were, in fact, twelve gods and as many goddesses, to whom divine honors were due, who, though they had all a certain power, were nevertheless obliged to obey Odin as the most ancient of the gods, and the great principle of all things. Among these lesser deities were Njord, the Neptune of the north; Baldur, the god of wisdom and eloquence; Tyr, another warlike god, the patron of brave men; Bragi, who presided over poetry, and his wife Iduna, who guarded the mystic fruit which renewed the perpetual youth of the gods. The porter of the heavens was Heimdall, who guarded the bridge (the rainbow) between heaven and earth, and who was stationed at one end thereof, and provided with a sword to prevent the giants and enemies of the gods from crossing it, and with a trumpet whose notes resounded through all the worlds; he also was gifted with the faculty of sleeping lightly, and with such delicate sense of hearing that he could hear the grass grow in the fields and the wool grow on the backs of the sheep. There was also the god Soki, the evil principle and calumniator of the gods; among his

numerous children were the wolf Fenrir, the serpent Midgard, and Hela, or Death. Besides the twelve goddesses, of whom Frigg, the wife of Odin, was the chief, there were three Fates called Nornas, who, under Odin, determined the lives and deaths of men; and the maidens of Odin, called Valkyrjers, who were continually rushing through the ether, seeking in all countries the bravest heroes, whom they marked with their spear-point when the hour of death had come. The Scandinavians had their oracles, divinations, auspices, presages, lots and other superstitions, and carried these follies to as great an excess as any other heathen people. There were two different abodes for the happy; one was Valhalla, the palace of Odin, where he received all who died from violence and valiantly from the beginning to the end of the world; the other was called Gimli, the palace covered with gold, where the just were to enjoy eternal happiness. So also there were two places of future punishment; the first of these was named Niflheim, and was only to continue to the final renovation of the world, or the last judgment; and the other was called Náströnd, the shore of the dead, and was eternal in duration and punishment. This belief of a continual and immediate action of the Supreme Divinity on all creatures, and in the power of the Fates to determine all human events, and that at his birth every man had his destiny and duration of life fixed by an inferior deity assisting at his birth, made the Scandinavians not only the most immovable stoics, but also the most inveterate fatalists. Hence their ruling passion was for war. They had a blind temerity and a predominant recklessness in meeting tortures and death. It was believed that a hero's life might be prolonged if any one else would put himself in his place and die in his stead, and that Odin, appeased by such a sacrifice, revoked the decree of the destinies and prolonged the life of the one who was so fortunate as to thus have a willing substitute at the hour of death. Whatever the passions or impulses of a Northman prompted him to do, however sudden, unjust, cruel or reckless, was right when done, because all things done were fore-ordained. Piracy, murder, suicide, relentless war, and whatever gave vent and gratification to their passions, were not only common with the Scandinavians, but in fact constituted their glory and their happiness. The case of Charles XII., of Sweden, in more recent times, illustrates how men can become possessed with the hereditary fatalism of the Northmen, and care not for danger and meet fate with immovable temerity. Such a religion left but little room for moral precepts, and yet it inculcated besides intrepidity in war, the service of the gods and the offering of sacrifices to them; that men should not be unjust; should extend hospitality to strangers; should be faithful to the marriage vow, and keep their word inviolable. In

Valhalla the heroes, called Einheriars, passed their time every day in the pleasure of arming themselves, marshalling themselves in military order, fighting and knocking down one another; but in the evening they got upon their feet again and returned to Valhalla, where Odin had a grand feast prepared for them, consisting of the flesh of the wild boar, which, though butchered every day, returned again to life to be slaughtered each day for the happy; and at the feast the Valkyrjers, Odin's beautiful virgins, presented to them the celestial mead to drink from the curved horns, until they were all in a state of utter intoxication. It seems that Wormius, Bartholin and other writers were mistaken in supposing that they drank their mead from "*the skulls of our enemies*," and in so translating the language of the *Edda*, as has been demonstrated by Finn Magnusen and professor Rafn. And Southey was mistaken in following the impression of the older writers when he wrote:

"They thought
One day from Ella's skull to quaff the mead,
Their valour's guerdon."

The passage in the Icelandic prose *Edda* which gave rise to this question of drinking their mead from the skulls of their enemies, is as follows, and it, at the same time, illustrates the sentiments which caused the Scandinavians to make war their business and to carry their valor to the utmost excesses of fanaticism. The passage in question gives the language of King Ragnar Lodbrok at the moment of his death: "We are cut to pieces with swords; but this fills me with joy, when I think of the feast that is preparing for me in Odin's palace. Quickly, quickly seated in the splendid habitation of the gods, *we shall drink beer out of curved horns*. A brave man fears not to die. I shall utter no timorous words as I enter the Hall of Odin." The Scandinavian gods were worshipped partly in the open air, in groves, or places encompassed by a circle of big stones, partly in wooden temples, among which that in Upsala, in Sweden, was the most famous. The public worship was generally conducted by the heads of families, and here sacrifices were the chief feature, the usual victims being horses, oxen, young swine, hawks and cocks. Before Odin conquered the north, human victims were offered in sacrifice to the gods, and the people were not free from cannibalism in more ancient times. Festivals were held in honor of the gods, the principal one being the Yule Feast, which afterwards became the Christmas of the Northmen. The days of the week were named after the gods, and to this day we have in our own English calendar four days of the week which are yet named after the heathen deities of the Northmen: Tuesday is named after the Scandina-

navian god Tyr, Wednesday is named after the god Odin or Woden, Thursday is named after the god Thor, and Friday is named after the goddess Frigga or Fria, the wife of Odin.

But the dominion of the gods of Valhalla was not to last forever. In the end "the world was to be judged by righteousness," and this was to happen when Loki, the evil deity, succeeded in killing Baldur, the wisest of the gods of Valhalla and their defender; then a new earth would arise from the ocean, and the Almighty God could descend to judge men in righteousness. The good and true could enter the golden palace of Odin, Gimli, illumined by the light proceeding from the countenance of Odin, to live forever in happiness and in companionship with the gods themselves, then purified by fire. But the evil, such as perjurers, murderers and seducers, were to be cast down into Náströnd to suffer in eternal fire. Heroism, in a pagan sense, was the highest of all virtues. Woman was respected and defended among them, and she was, to a great degree, regarded as man's equal and companion; her virtue was defended, and seducers and adulterers were dealt with in the severest manner. Woman had as great a passion for war as man, and no young man could win the hand and heart of the Norse virgin unless he had gained some renown in war. Drinking was a prevalent custom, almost a religious observance, with the Scandinavians, for at religious festivals and celebrations they drank to the gods in succession, and their Yule Feast or Christmas was kept with high revelry. While the earth, water, fire, air, sun, moon and stars, and even trees, forests, rivers, mountains, rocks, winds, thunder and tempests, had their respective deities, the Scandinavians always recognized and worshipped one deity as superior to all, the rewarder of the good and the punisher of the wicked.

The following historical scenes and incidents will illustrate more effectually than a mythological treatise the practical effect of their religion upon the character and conduct of the Northmen, their courage and their contempt of death, the lawless piracy they practised, and the manner in which prisoners were treated. In the year 994 took place the piratical expedition of the Jomsburg sea-rovers, the Spartans of Scandinavia, along the coast of Norway; the following account is taken from the pages of Mallet's "Northern Antiquities": "Sailing along the coast of Norway with a powerful fleet, they signalized their approach by plundering, burning, killing all the men capable of bearing arms, and by the perpetration of all those other revolting and remorseless deeds which, in those ages, invariably marked the progress of a band of Scandinavian freebooters. The crafty Norwegian, Jarl Hakon, having in the meantime collected his forces, sailed with a fleet of one hundred and fifty vessels, and fell in with the Jomsburg fleet at a place called Hjo-

rungavag (now Lievog), and at break of day a combat began, which was maintained by the sea-rovers with their accustomed valor, though they were greatly inferior in numbers to the Norwegians. Hakon, in fact, after trying in vain to break through the line of his opponent, found it prudent to retire with his fleet to the coast, and we are told that he then went into a forest to consult a famous sorceress, or prophetess, called Thorgerd Hordabrud, in whom he put all his trust in any great emergency. She was, however, for a long time deaf to his supplications for assistance, although Hakon prostrated himself on the earth before her and offered to perform any bloody sacrifice she might require. She at length told him that the victory could only be obtained by the sacrifice of his son Erling, a very handsome boy, then in his seventh year. Hakon did not hesitate to offer up his son, and then returned to his fleet and renewed the engagement. Towards evening a dreadful thunderstorm arose, during which hailstones of an unusual size fell on board the Jomsburg vessels. The sea-rovers also fancied that they saw Thorgerd Hordabrud herself at the prow of Hakon's ship, with whole volleys of arrows flying from her fingers, each arrow bringing to one of them his death-wound. Twenty-five of the Jomsburg ships had already fallen into the hands of the Norwegians, when Sigvald cut the cable by which the remainder were fastened together, and bidding the other chieftians follow him, sailed away from the combat, saying that he had made a vow to fight against men and not against witches. Meanwhile, Hakon and his son Eirck boarded the vessel of Bui the Thick, and when that chieftain saw that further resistance was fruitless, he took two chests of gold, and calling out, "Overboard all Bui's men," plunged with his treasure in the sea and perished. Thorkell and Sigurd then took to flight and arrived in Denmark with thirty vessels. Vagn, however, continued to fight valiantly with his division against the combined forces of the Norwegians, but was at length overpowered and taken prisoner with thirty of his followers.

"The next morning, when Hakon and his sons had breakfasted, they ordered the prisoners to be led to execution. The proceedings on this occasion show, at the same time, the barbarity of the age and the kind of heroism which was more the result of this barbarity than of the pretended legislation of Palnatoki. The prisoners being seated on a log of wood with their legs bound together by a rope, withes or osier twigs were twisted in their hair. A slave was then placed behind each to keep his head steady by holding fast the withes twisted into a band for that purpose. The executioner was no less a personage than Thorkell Leire, one of the most renowned Norwegian chieftains, whose daughter Vagn had vowed to gain possession of without the consent of her relations.

Thorkell began his sanguinary task by striking off the head of him who sat outmost on the log. After he had beheaded the next two he asked the prisoners what they thought of death. 'What happened to my father,' replied one, 'must happen to me. He died, so must I.' Another said that he remembered too well the laws of Jomsburg to fear dying; a third declared that a glorious death was ever welcome to him, and that such a death was far more preferable than an infamous life like that of Thorkell's. 'I only beg of thee,' said a fourth, 'to be quick over thy work, for thou must know that it is a question often discussed at Jomsburg whether or not a man feels anything after losing his head. I will therefore grasp this knife in my hand; if, after my head is cut off, I throw it at thee, it will show that I still retain some feeling; if I let it fall, it will prove just the contrary. Strike, therefore, and decide the question without further delay.' Thorkell, says the Saga-man, struck off the man's head with a stroke of his battle-axe, but the knife instantly fell to the ground. 'Strike the blow in my face,' said the next, 'I will sit still without flinching, and take notice whether I even wink my eyes; for we Jomsburg people know how to meet the strike of death without betraying an emotion.' He kept his promise, and received the blow without showing the least sign of fear, or so much as winking his eyes. Sigurd, the son of Bui the Thick, a fine young man in the flower of his age, with long fair hair as fine as silk, flowing in ringlets over his shoulders, said, in answer to Thorkell's question, 'I fear not death, since I have fulfilled the greatest duty of life, but I must pray thee not to let my hair be touched by a slave or stained with my blood.' One of Hakon's followers then stepped forward and held his hair instead of the slave, but when Thorkell struck the blow, Sigurd twitched his head forward so strongly that the warrior who was holding his hair had both his hands cut off. Eirek, the son of Jarl Hakon, who seemed to have relished this practical joke, then came up and asked Sigurd whether he would have his life spared. 'That depends,' replied the youth, 'upon who it is that makes me the offer.' 'He who has the power to do it, Jarl Eirek,' said the son of the Norwegian chieftain. 'From his hand will I accept it,' said Sigurd, and he was immediately loosed from the rope. Thorkell, enraged at Eirek's clemency, exclaimed: 'If thou spare the lives of all these men, Jarl, at least Vagn Akason shall not escape me.' So saying, he ran at Vagn with uplifted axe, but the crafty sea-rover threw himself on the ground so Thorkell fell over him and cut the rope with his axe, seeing which, Vagn sprang up, and seizing the weapon, gave Thorkell his death-wound. Jarl Eirek, notwithstanding his father's remonstrances, then asked Vagn if he would accept life from his hands. 'Willingly,' replied Vagn, 'pro-

vided thou wilt give it to all of us.' 'Loose the rope,' said Eirek, and it was done; eighteen had been beheaded and twelve were spared by Eirek thus interfering, among whom was a Welshman named Bjorn. After this the army dispersed. Jarl Hakon went to Drontheim, highly dissatisfied with his son's proceedings. Jarl Eirek, however, does not seem to have cared much for his father's displeasure, for we are told that he shortly afterward married Vagn to Thorkell Leire's daughter Ingjibjörg, the young lady, be it remembered, whom the sea-rovers had vowed to gain possession of without her friends' consent, and whose father he had actually killed. However, such events were of frequent occurrence in those turbulent ages, and would not be regarded as singular. Vagn, after his marriage, returned to Denmark with three ships, which Eirek had made him a present of, and became a renowned chieftain and the founder of a powerful family.

"Sigvald, on his arrival at Jomsburg, was received very coolly by his fair lady, Astrida, who jeered him ever afterwards for returning from a battle without a single wound, an action which in her eyes was quite unpardonable."

The conversion of such a people to Christianity was no easy task. The arguments of force, power, courage and human glory were more powerful with them than dogma, faith, or sanctity. The arbitrament of the sword was their *ultima ratio*. Appealing to war, as they did on all occasions, and for the settlement of all disputes, they abided by the harsh yet unappealable result, and when the cross and the sword came together they accepted the one when, and when only, they could not overcome the power of the other. This was the only power that had any influence with them. When vanquished at arms, they acquiesced in the adoption of the new religion at the mandate of king or parliament. In Norway, more than in any other Scandinavian country, the struggle between Christianity and paganism was conducted on the field of battle, and thus civil war prevailed until the cross of Christ overcame the mallet of Thor.

In those early days, both the Church and the State took an active part in the spread of the Gospel among heathen nations. Emperor and Pontiff went forward in measures for the evangelization of the pagan peoples of the north of Europe, and thus it was that Charlemagne, Louis his son, and their successors, on the one hand, and Gregory IV. and Leo IV., and the Pontiffs of that immediate age, on the other hand, stand forth as prominent actors in the conquests of the Christian faith. We do not read of formal concordats in the times of the Charlemagnes, or of the Ethelberts and Louises, for in those days it was a question of doing the most with munificent hand and pious heart for the advancement of re-

ligion, by Roman Pontiffs and by the Christian nations, among their pagan and heathen neighbors, the rude and barbarous nations of the North. The age of the concordats marks the time when, among Christian nations and with Christian kings, princes and emperors, it became necessary to stipulate by treaty for the conservation, protection, and defence of the interests of religion in the Christian states themselves. Struggles between Ghibellines and Guelphs belong to a later period in the history of the world and of the Church, and these struggles have led to the negotiation of many a concordat between Pope and Potentate, the Ghibelline representing the imperial and feudal hierarchy, the Guelph representing the Church and national independence.

But in the earlier period, of which we are now writing, the mild and peaceful measures and counsels of the Pontiffs of Rome had not unfrequently to restrain the impetuous methods and measures of the newly-converted Christian kings and princes. For it was not an uncommon thing for missionary expeditions to the middle and north of Europe in those days to be accompanied with military outfits and armies of organized and national character, bent at once on the religious conversion and civil subjugation of the invaded peoples. Thus, it is undoubtedly true that the cross and the sword went together in the gigantic work of converting, forming, and cementing together the Christendom of the Middle Ages. An instance of this kind, out of many recorded in the chronicles of those days, will be given hereafter as a part of the more immediate history we are going to relate concerning the conversion of the Northmen, whose mariners and vikings, whose priests and bishops, were the first to discover and the first to evangelize the continent of America. It is also undoubtedly true that more than one of the Roman Pontiffs, influenced by the mild and gentle precepts of the Apostolic faith, had to restrain and condemn this method of propagating the Gospel among heathen nations by force, and more than one illustrious Pope issued his Bull to forbid, in express terms, the sending of military expeditions into heathen lands for the propagation of the Christian faith. Such expeditions were more or less in keeping with the spirit of that early age, with the condition, customs, and necessities of the times, and with the indomitable and unanswerable argument of brute force, which was the only principle for which many of the barbarous nations of that day, such as the Northmen, themselves pre-eminently so, had the slightest respect. And it is a curious feature, witnessed in the history of those days, that the parliament and king of a brave and fearless people would by edict or statute, enacted in a single day, change absolutely the religion of the nation and the people. The principle that Christian faith is a free and voluntary

act of the will and conscience, which cannot be coerced, which cannot be created or annihilated by force, seems to have been better understood at Rome than in the palaces of the rude but chivalrous kings, and in the legislative halls, of that strong and robust era of the world, for it was from Rome that the Pontiffs issued their edicts against the propagation of the Christian faith among heathen nations by force.

The Christian kings and emperors of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, with the consent of, or by some privilege sanctioned by, the Holy See, took an active part in the historic progress of the Church. Not only did they sit or be represented in the general councils of the Church, a right which seems to have ceased only with the Council of the Vatican, but they founded sees and dioceses within their dominions, and sent their nominees for the episcopacy either to Rome or to some neighboring archbishop or bishop for consecration. Such was the accord between the Church and the Christian state. Pontiff and king united in the great work of Christianizing the world. It was thus that Pope Gregory, in his Bull to St. Ansgar, to which we are about to refer more fully, makes special mention of the intention entertained by Charlemagne in his lifetime of supplying the northern nations with missionaries and bishops, and Louis, his successor and son, divided the whole territory beyond the Elbe between two neighboring bishops, Villeric of Bremen and Herigald of Werden; and it is related that Louis, remembering the intentions of his illustrious father, and with the consent of the bishops and of a numerous council, established an archiepiscopal see at Hamburg, for the purpose of sending bishops and priests to the regions north of the Elbe and the other northern countries. He selected as the missionary bishop of the northern countries St. Ansgar, and in 832 sent him to be consecrated as Archbishop of Hamburg by Drogon, Bishop of Metz, who was brother of the Emperor Louis and son of Charlemagne, in the presence of three archbishops, Ebbon of Rheims, Hetti of Treves, and Olgard of Mentz, and several bishops, including the bishops of Bremen and Werden; all of whom took part in the consecration of St. Ansgar, in token of their sanction. The Emperor Louis then sent St. Ansgar to Rome with letters to Pope Gregory IV. asking his formal approval. The Pope testified his approval by a decree, gave St. Ansgar the *pallium*, and named him and Ebbon, Archbishop of Rheims, as Apostolic Legates of the Swedes, Danes, and other northern nations, for St. Ansgar had previously preached the Gospel among those northern peoples, and had won the title of Apostle of the North. Pope Gregory IV., at the tomb of St. Peter, gave him authority to preach the Gospel publicly, and pronounced an anathema on any one who should

dare to throw obstacles in his way. This account is taken almost verbatim from the contemporaneous biographer of St. Ansgar. Hamburg, the episcopal city of St. Ansgar, was burned in 845 by the Normans, and the saint spent himself in his efforts to support his desolate churches. In 849, the see of Bremen becoming vacant, the Pope united the sees of Hamburg and Bremen, and appointed St. Ansgar metropolitan of the united dioceses. While St. Ansgar was simply a priest, Harold, prince of Denmark, then on a visit to the Emperor Louis, became converted and was baptized at the imperial court. St. Ansgar, under the protection and authority of the prince, went to the north as missionary, and succeeded in introducing Christianity, first into Denmark, and then into Sweden; for, under the princely authority and power, little ceremony was observed in overturning the altars of Odin and Thor when the people themselves refused to do so. But St. Ansgar's mission was one of peace and persuasion. On his return to receive episcopal consecration, he left many apostolic missionaries in the northern countries to continue the great work he had commenced. On his return to the north as Archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, he found that Denmark and Sweden had relapsed into paganism and idolatry. In Denmark, finding in King Hovick a friend of the Christian religion, the people yielded to the royal pleasure and the zealous appeals of the saint. But in Sweden the superstitious King Olof, against the remonstrances of St. Ansgar, who refused to sanction the decision of the cause of God and of religion by the cast of a die, insisting that the issue be left to the care of Heaven, persisted in ordering that lots be cast to determine whether the Apostolic missionary and his companions should be admitted into the country. The cast of the lots proved favorable to Ansgar and his cause; he entered the country and evangelized it with his characteristic zeal and success; he converted many among the ranks of the people, and founded many churches, which he left under zealous pastors on his return to Bremen. Of this great Apostle of the North Dr. Alban Butler writes: "He wore a rough hair shirt, and, whilst his health permitted him, contented himself with a small quantity of bread and water. He never undertook anything without recommending it first to God by earnest prayer, and had an extraordinary talent for preaching. His charity to the poor had no bounds; he washed their feet, and waited on them at table. He ascribed it to his sins that he had never met with the glory of martyrdom in all that he had suffered for the faith. To excite himself to compunction, and to the divine praise, he made a collection of pathetic sentences, some of which he placed at the end of each psalm, several of which are found in certain manuscript psalters, as Fleury takes notice. The learned Fabricius, in his Latin

library of the Middle Ages, calls them an illustrious monument of this holy prelate."

St. Ansgar had succeeded in introducing Christianity into Denmark and Sweden, and, although many vestiges of paganism remained, he lived to enjoy the happiness of seeing his apostolic labors bearing abundant fruit. But the less tractable Norwegians still remained engulfed in ancient idolatry and superstition. In the middle of the ninth century, King Harold Harfaga, of Norway, publicly renounced the worship of Odin and the other Scandinavian gods, long before Christianity was introduced, and prohibited piracy, one of the favorite occupations of the Northmen. He completed the conquest of Norway in 880. Rollo conquered and founded the province of Normandy in France, became Christian in 912, bequeathed Normandy to his descendants, and gave a dynasty of Norse kings to England. In 940, Hakon the Good endeavored, in vain, to induce his countrymen, the Northmen of Norway, to adopt the Christian faith. He had been educated at the court of Athelstan of England, his foster-father, and was a Christian. Returning to Norway, notwithstanding his faith he was elected king. When offered the royal mead in crooked horns, to drink at his coronation, he is said to have made upon it the sign of the cross; but his countrymen noticing this, one of his wily courtiers parried all further inquiry by alleging that the king had made the sign of the crossed mallets of Thor, and Hakon weakly connived at the evasion. But this unfortunate prince, though he remained at heart attached to the doctrines of Christ, shrank from avowing them openly to his nobles and people, and united with them in offering sacrifices to Odin and the other heathen gods. Better had he remained and died a pensioner on the bounty of the English king. As he lay dying, after the battle of Stord, he once more avowed his true convictions and said: "Were a longer life allowed me, I would go to Christian men and pray for pardon of my sins against God; but I have lived a heathen and as a heathen must be buried; lay me, therefore, where ye shall judge best."

King Olaf Tryggvason was the champion of Christianity in Norway, and introduced it into that country about the close of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh centuries. His reign and that of his successor, Saint Olaf, also king of Norway, are striking illustrations of the zeal of the early Christian converts in that rude age and among the warlike nations of the North. Olaf Tryggvason devoted his entire reign to the propagation of Christianity in Norway. The methods adopted by the two Olafs to convert the country were peculiar; and as the accounts of their lives were written by Icelandic monks, and their reigns stand forth in glory in the history of their times and country, and as the means they adopted were in conformity with the manner in which other

northern countries had been evangelized in those early ages, there can be no doubt of the correctness of the narratives. The first Olaf travelled from district to district of Norway, accompanied by a band of holy and eloquent Christian missionaries, and at the same time by a strong body of trained soldiers. The first thing he did was to summon the Thing, or local parliament, or court of the people, to assemble, and he gave them the alternative of fighting or receiving baptism. As few of such districts were prepared to meet so formidable an army as the king's, they generally acquiesced and accepted baptism and the faith from the hands of the missionaries. To such as became converted he extended unbounded favor and protection; but to the recusants he showed no mercy, either in their persons or their estates. Of this king, and of the methods adopted by him and others for extending the Gospel in the North, the following passage occurs in an able article in the *Dublin Review* of December, 1847. "The romantic, but, we think, well authenticated, Saga of Olaf Tryggvason tells us that the mild sway of Christ was at length forced with the sword upon the heathen Vikings of Norway. For a mission accompanied with violence, no apology can be made, but some allowance must be given for the warlike spirit of the age, where personal strength and the sharp sword were the strongest arguments with a comparatively illiterate people."

The following incident throws light upon the character of King Olaf and his methods, upon the customs of the Northmen, and shows that Olaf, in one instance at least, used persuasion rather than force to make converts. Two distinguished Icelanders, Kjartan and Bolli, being on a visit in their ships to Norway for pleasure and trade, arrived on one fine autumn day at the harbor of Drontheim, and, joining in the favorite amusement of the people there, took part in the swimming and aquatic exercises. Kjartan, making up to one of the most dexterous of the Norwegian swimmers, succeeded in ducking him under the water. The Norwegian on rising succeeded in ducking in turn the Iclander, and so the two champion swimmers continued for some time to display their strength and agility, amid the cheers of the spectators, until it was decided they were fully a match for each other. On coming to land the Norwegian asked Kjartan who he was and whether he was as expert in other feats as he had shown himself to be at swimming.

"If people in Iceland did not rate my other qualities higher than my swimming," coldly replied Kjartan, "I should not have much to boast of."

"That depends upon whom thou hast for a competitor," said the Norwegian; "and methinks thou mightst condescend to inquire the name of the person thou hast now been contending with."

"It is a matter of perfect indifference to me," replied Kjartan, "what thy name may be."

"By my troth, 'tis a hardy fellow I have to deal with!" exclaimed the Norwegian; "but although thou art too proud to ask, I will tell thee my name—know, then, that it is Olaf Tryggvason thou hast been swimming with."

Kjartan, making no answer, hurried in his swimming attire to his ship, when King Olaf called him back, and taking off his rich scarlet mantle, placed it on the shoulders of the Icelander, saying: "There, as thou hast now no occasion to fear taking cold, thou needst not be in such a hurry to leave me!"

King Olaf was at this time in the third year of his reign; he had already succeeded in converting his courtiers, and at a Thing (parliamentary assembly of the people), then recently held since Kjartan's arrival, had managed to persuade most of the inhabitants of Drontheim to accept baptism. He had laid an embargo on three of the Icelandic vessels belonging to Kjartan's party lying in the harbor of Drontheim on account of their crews refusing to embrace Christianity and receive baptism, and he gave all the Icelanders there to understand that they should not set sail until they too had accepted baptism. The Icelanders were indignant; they reproached Kjartan for accepting the royal mantle from the king, which they regarded as equivalent to acknowledging himself in the royal service; they held a meeting on board their ships to consider the king's ultimatum. Bolli declared his disinclination "to embrace such effeminate doctrines as those of Christianity appeared to be." But Kjartan surprised them all by the audacity of his proposal, for, rising in the meeting, he said:

"And I am of the opinion that instead of sitting here to be taken like sheep in a fold, and compelled, as these poor Norwegians have been, to kneel before a kirtled monk, we should do better to fall on King Olaf, and burn him in his palace."

This plan, though highly approved, was deemed too hazardous, and after a long discussion the meeting "*adjourned sine die*," as we Americans would say, without arriving at any conclusion. The king, who had been fully informed of the meeting by his spies, next day summoned the Icelanders to his presence, and told them he was fully determined to make them Christians before they left Drontheim, and added that he was well aware that one of their number had proposed to burn him to death in his palace. Whereupon Kjartan unhesitatingly avowed that it was he who had made the proposal.

"Well, this time I will not punish thee," said the king, "and as ye are averse to the doctrines of Christianity, ye may depart in peace, for the God we worship does not wish that any one should be brought to Him by compulsion."

"In this manner," replied Kjartan, "I may be induced to become a Christian; and at all events will promise that next winter, in Iceland, Thor shall not often be worshipped by me."

The Icelanders tarried at Drontheim till Christmas, the Yule feast of the Scandinavians, and they all attended a solemn midnight Mass, at which the monks produced the most imposing and the grandest ceremonies and music of the Church, and at which King Olaf delivered one of his most earnest and eloquent homilies on the Christian faith. Hereupon the Icelanders in a body declared their readiness to become Christians and receive baptism, and the ceremony was performed on the spot. England had already become Catholic, and much commercial intercourse had been going on between that country and Iceland, and through the channels of commerce many English monks and missionaries had for years visited Iceland and to a considerable extent familiarized the Icelanders with Christianity, and made many converts. Before its discovery by the Norwegians, Iceland had become a place of retreat and religious seclusion for English and Irish monks and anchorites, for it is related in the Icelandic "*Landanama Book*," one of the most ancient and most authentic historical authorities, that in 875, when the Norwegian Ingolf and the first Norwegian settlers went to Iceland, "there were here Christian people, whom the Northmen called *Papas*, but they afterwards went away because they would not be here among heathens; and left behind them Irish books and bells, and croziers (crosses), from which it could be seen that they were Irishmen." English writers, including the Venerable Bede, and the *Saga of King Olaf Tryggvason*, make mention of the same. So that after the conversion of the Icelanders at the midnight Mass at Drontheim, Kjartan proposed to go with his trading vessel to England, having heard that Scandinavians, who had renounced heathenism and embraced Christianity, were favorably received in that country. King Olaf told him he would have preferred his returning to Icelend and preaching Christianity there; but at all events the king would wish him to remain with him and become one of the leading attendants at his court. Kjartan, receiving handsome presents from the king, including a court-dress, one of the king's own suits, which, as they were of the same size, fitted him admirably, became a courtier at the throne of Olaf Tryggvason. The king then sent his court-chaplain, Thangbrand, to convert the Icelanders, but the Icelandic Scalds and Saga-men so ridiculed his religion and his mission that he returned to Norway without success. King Olaf then put an embargo on all Icelandic vessels in Norway, and sent two Icelandic converts and exiles, Hjalti and Gissur, to Iceland to convert the country, retaining Kjartan and three other Icelanders as hostages for their

safety. This was in the summer of the year of Our Lord 1000, and such was the success of the zealous converts and missionaries, that in that same year of grace Christianity, by the solemn decree of the Icelandic Al-Thing (solemn assembly of the people), became the national religion of Iceland. Thereupon King Olaf released the embargoed Icelandic vessels, Kjartan and all the Icelanders were permitted to return home, and, while Christianity became the settled religion of Norway and Iceland and her people, Olaf and his sainted successor had before them still years of struggle for the establishment of the true faith among the stubborn and heathen Norwegians and Icelanders.

St. Olaf, King of Norway, was even a more zealous apostle of the faith than King Olaf Tryggvason, and his methods for its propagation were the same as those of the latter. With a chosen band of three hundred picked soldiers, he traversed his kingdom, and overthrew the altars and idols of paganism, and wherever the milder persuasions of the zealous and eloquent missionaries, who also accompanied his crusades, did not prevail, the sword was sure to do so. The following account of this sainted monarch is taken from the pages of Dr. Alban Butler's "Lives of the Saints." "This religious king, having settled his dominions in peace, set himself to extirpate out of them the abominable superstitions of idolatry. He travelled in person from town to town, exhorting his subjects to open the eyes of their souls to the bright light of faith. A company of zealous preachers attended him, and he demolished in many places the idolatrous temples. The heathens rebelled, and, with the assistance of Canutus the Great, defeated and expelled him. Olaf fled to Russia, whence he soon after returned, and raised an army in order to recover his kingdom, but was slain by his rebellious and infidel subjects, in a battle fought at Stichstadt, north of Drontheim, on the twenty-ninth of July, 1030, having reigned sixteen years. St. Olaf's body was honorably buried in the Cathedral at Drontheim, and the year following Bishop Grimkele commanded him to be honored in that church among the saints with the title of martyr. His son, Magnus, was called home from Russia, in 1035, and restored to the throne. The body of St. Olaf was found incorrupt in 1098; and again when the Lutherans in 1541 plundered the shrine, which was adorned with gold and jewels of great value. The Lutherans treated the saint's body with great respect, and left it in the same place where the shrine had stood, in the inner wooden case, until, in 1568, they decently buried it in the same cathedral. His shrine became famous by many miracles, and he was honored with extraordinary devotion throughout all the northern kingdoms, and was titular saint of several churches in England and Scotland." And we might add that subsequently Christian churches were under his invocation in our western hemisphere.

PROFESSOR FISHER ON "UNSECTARIANISM" IN THE COMMON SCHOOLS.

IT is encouraging to find a writer appealing to logic, especially when so many, whether from fear or over-much reverence, keep at such a respectful distance from it. He may indeed badly disappoint us, but he emboldens us to note any departure from this acknowledged standard, to insist on logical cogency, and to ask for proof instead of assertion whenever he assumes the rôle of reasoner.

Accordingly, in an article which Prof. Fisher has contributed to the *Forum* for last April, criticising an article by Cardinal Manning in an earlier issue of the same periodical, we naturally enough look for the Professor's reason for attributing to the Cardinal "so many pages of misleading statement and of fallacious—it would not be wrong to say sophistical—reasoning as make up his recent article in the *Forum*." The reason assigned by the learned Professor is the simple evident fact that the Cardinal never lived in America. But how this can weigh with impartial judgment is not so evident, especially since the Cardinal is careful to tell us: "Being called on by an American to speak, I will not be silent. Nevertheless, I shall confine myself to the *ipsissima verba*, the very syllables, of American citizens, and of some of great public responsibility." Mr. Richard Grant White and Hon. Zach. Montgomery, whose words the Cardinal makes the "foundation" of his argument, did not labor under the disadvantage of non-residence in America.

How, again, a short residence in America would have taught Cardinal Manning that "statistics are good for nothing and prove nothing," is hard to see, nor does our logical Professor throw any light on the difficulty. Statistics are statistics the world over, for a reasoner in England as much as for a reasoner in America. Reasoning abstracts from the *hic et nunc* in its valid processes. Either the statistics must be denied, or the reasoner must not be blamed for using them. If they are valid premises whereon to build a sound argument in other cases, why not in the case of the public-school question, in the case of education? Statistics are reckoned good for *much* in debates of weightiest importance in Congress and out of Congress, in courts of judicature, in America, in the British Parliament, in Germany, everywhere. Is it only when applied to the school question that they are "good for nothing and prove nothing"? Is this a specimen of the logic that undertakes to support so vital a question as education before an enlightened, freedom-loving, and impartial American public?

BUT Prof. Fisher insists that by a very short residence in America the Cardinal "would be aware that the opinions adverse to our common-school system, which he quotes from Richard Grant White and the rest of his authorities, are utterly contrary to the judgment of the great body of Americans of high principle and robust intelligence whose ancestors were born on the soil."

Without inquiring where the ancestors of Mr. R. G. White or the "rest of his authorities" were born, whether on the soil or not, it might perhaps be easily maintained that the opinions of these gentlemen, though "utterly contrary to the judgment" of those so complacently styled "of high principle and robust intelligence," are just as reliable as, and a good deal more reasonable than, are those of their critic. It is a strange conceit that would attach "high principle and robust intelligence" to those whose ancestors happened to be "born on the soil," especially in a republic whose first claim to existence, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, rests upon the "self-evident truth, that all men are created equal," and in a country, too, where, if traced little more than a century back, the best of those "born on the soil" were foreign subjects; and traced a little farther still, ancestry vanishes, and all are found to be incomers. Add to this the fact that the highest and most responsible office of trust in the gift of the American people is open to the worthy candidate who was himself "born on the soil," no matter what country gave birth to his parents. It is indeed the peculiar boast, the honest pride, and noble privilege of every American citizen that, independent and irrespective of ancestry, no matter who his parents or where they came from, if he himself is of "high principle and robust intelligence," he is made to feel 'tis "worth makes the man, and want of it the fellow." It did not detract from his merit nor hinder his promotion to the pinnacle of honor and trust, that General Sheridan came of parents who were born in Ireland. Nor did it detract from the acknowledged ability and tact and patriotism of another American citizen, that not even himself was "born on the soil," when Archbishop Hughes, of New York, in the darkest hour of the Civil War, cheerfully complied with the request of the Government to plead the cause of the Union before some of the powers of Europe, and to influence public opinion in favor of the north. Alluding to this, Secretary Seward wrote in 1864: "At a juncture of deep interest to the country, the Archbishop, associated with others, went abroad and did the nation a service there, with all the loyalty, fidelity, and practical wisdom which, on so many other occasions, illustrated his great ability for administration."

In the name of logic, to which the learned Professor appeals, we ask, what has Cardinal Manning's antecedents to do with the

validity of his reasoning in the *Forum*? What has Ultra- or Citramontanism to do with the argument? What weak point in his article will the candid critic detect from the fact that even before the infallible decision of the Vatican Council he held the doctrine propounded by that decision and immediately subscribed to by the small minority? Did it show lack of judgment, of intelligence, or of fearless freedom, to have defended vigorously a position which even his opponents declared was right, while theirs was wrong? Everybody must see the force of this irrelevancy as going far to prove a weakness either in the cause or in its defender, or in both, and a corresponding robustness in the argumentative array it leaves unscathed. It certainly has not the effect of lowering in public estimation one whom even Gladstone's versatile genius, with all the energy put forth in his "Expostulation," could only serve to render more conspicuous for "high principle and robust intelligence" in having so strenuously advocated truths and rights that so signally triumphed over the "anger and alarm of the civil authority in Catholic as well as in Protestant lands."

But this long detail of irrelevant matter, embracing what we are told the Cardinal said and did and thought in the past, if it has no possible bearing upon the logical issue, is made, however, to do good service as a sort of preamble to the Professor's easy assumption: "Of course, the Cardinal can look on the American system of government—on the idea of a free Church in a free State—with no other feeling than intense disapprobation."

Who told him, how knows he, what the Cardinal can or cannot look on without disapprobation? What he did disapprove of he had the courage, when asked, frankly to declare; but more than that, he gave his reasons. It became the Professor to meet these reasons squarely, instead of diverting attention into another channel. Or does he mean to tell us that one cannot be dissatisfied with the public-school system as now conducted, without being at the same time dissatisfied with the "American system of government"? Is there no difference, in his mind, between an essential constituent and an excrescence? We may not, then, wonder at his seeming unconsciousness of the contradiction when he calls the Cardinal an Ultramontanist. For an Ultramontanist is one with the Pope, having the same sentiments with him. But the Pope has expressed himself again and again as perfectly pleased with the relations subsisting between Catholics in America and their government, with our "free Church in a free State." And the late action of the several rulers in almost the whole world, during the celebration of the Papal Jubilee, demonstrates most forcibly that the Pope is universally regarded as inimical to no form of government on earth. Our late President did not think he was offending Leo XIII. by

giving him a copy of our Constitution, nor did any word or act of the distinguished recipient denote dissatisfaction. The Cardinal, "one of the foremost champions of the Ultramontanist school," must of course have been equally pleased with so appropriate an offering. But there was no blot there to disfigure the fair face of that noble document. No public-school system flourished there. Whoever adheres most closely to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, is certainly most friendly to the best interests of America. Not the Cardinal, then, but the advocate of the public schools is running counter to the true spirit of the Republic. The school system he disapproves of here he disapproves of at home in England. And yet he claims to be as loyal to the throne as Mr. Richard Grant White and Mr. Montgomery are to the Republic. And all three may claim as much devotedness to their respective forms of polity as can the advocates of the objectionable school systems on either side of the water, Prof. Fisher not excepted.

In the *Contemporary Review* (November, 1888), Canon Gregory, representing the Church of England, makes this comment (p. 645): "The Education Act of 1870 practically establishes a new religion, 'Undenominationalism,' for the elementary schools of the country, which has the singular merit of being a religion which nobody who cares for religion (whatever his faith or denomination may be) would teach his own children, but which for political reasons seems to be regarded as sufficiently good for the poorer classes."

Again, on p. 657, he says: "The majority demand religious liberty for believers as well as for unbelievers, for those who have a definite faith as much as for those who have none. At present—in England—the whole school-board rate is given to schools where no religious teaching is given, or where the religion taught is so nebulous that it does not admit of being expressed in a creed, or so indefinite that it cannot be formulated into the accurate terms of a catechism. This is enforced by Act of Parliament, and is not left to the free determination of the various bodies by whom school-rates are levied, and is, in my opinion, a gross violation of the principle of religious liberty."

Canon Gregory then quotes from the majority report of the Education Commission to show that all the evidence gathered by their prolonged investigation "is practically unanimous as to the desire of the parents for the religious and moral training of their children."

Rev. Thomas McMillan, C.S.P., in the *Catholic World* for April, commenting on the above words of Canon Gregory, says: "Our American school-boards make little or no provision for the wishes of parents. Let us hope that the parental voice will soon make itself heard in discussions of the educational question."

The members of the Royal Education Commission represented many denominations, and in their majority report agreed upon the following declaration, quoted by Canon Gregory :

"Whilst differing widely in our views concerning religious truth, we are persuaded that the only safe foundation on which to construct a theory of morals, or to secure high moral conduct, is the religion which our Lord Jesus Christ has taught the world. As we look to the Bible for instruction concerning morals, and take its words for the declaration of what is morality, so we look to the same inspired source for the sanctions by which men may be led to practise what is there taught, and for instruction concerning the help by which they may be enabled to do what they have learned to be right."

"What," continues Father McMillan, "has unsectarianism to offer as a substitute for this plain statement, which ought to be acceptable to all Christians? The genuine unsectarian code must be detached from every positive religious belief. Perhaps it is to be formed—for it does not yet exist—of the moral axioms, ancient and modern. According to one of the writers in the *Christian Register*, 'Axiomatic morality is moral moonshine.'"

So it is not Ultramontanists alone that object to the public-school system (it is one with the English system in the objectionable feature of excluding religion), nor are externs the only ones who think that the parental voice ought to be heard and parental rights respected. Far back in the centuries an English archbishop (Langton) could raise his voice in behalf of the liberties of his countrymen, and the Magna Charta was achieved. And one of the foremost advocates of freedom to-day, one of the fastest friends of the people, one of the most outspoken and fearless defenders of the rights of man as man, is confessedly Cardinal Manning.

It is only necessary to take Prof. Fisher's statements at random, *e medio acervo*, to find them abounding in contradictions. He boasts that "English and American liberty was gained by depriving government of many of its old prerogatives"; and almost in the same breath he blames those who are endeavoring to hinder governments from resuming these prerogatives or assuming similar ones. If resistance to unjust taxation, even by force, was, according to the Professor, eminently praiseworthy, how can a calm reasoning on the subject of another unjust taxation be condemnable? Or is it not unjust to tax people for the purchase of a commodity they cannot and will not consume? Is not the "plea for human rights, the rights of the individual and of the family," something more than "specious," even if they do "cut off the State from the office of providing the means of unsectarian education for the body of its citizens"? If the body of its citizens pro-

fess not "unsectarianism," how is it not unjust to have it imposed upon them? Why favor the few at the expense of the many? If the State cannot patronize any one form of religion, why patronize "unsectarianism," which means irreligion? According to Washington, who certainly is a good authority on the rights and duties of Americans, morality cannot be maintained without religion. "Unsectarianism" is, then, incapable of inculcating morality. But morality in the citizens is essential to the very existence of a republic. How, then, is he not the best friend to the Republic who endeavors to secure that which alone secures the stability of the Republic, viz., religion?

The Cardinal's statement, "The law of nature has invested parents with these responsibilities" (of teaching and training their children), "parents have the right to control the education of their children," the Professor does not attempt to deny; and for good reasons, for its truth cannot be denied. What, then, does he do? He sets right against right; and, of course, the right of the weaker must yield. The State is stronger; its right must therefore prevail over the rights of parents and children. Not so thought the framers of our Constitution and of the Declaration of Independence. Among the truths held to be self-evident is the endowment of all men by their Creator with the inalienable right "of pursuing happiness." But happiness here is but a stepping-stone to happiness hereafter. How, then, can the State interfere with this inalienable right by shutting out from the child's view this future happiness, and hindering the parents from securing it to their offspring? This the State does by shutting out religion from the school.

The Professor puts himself, in this contention, on the side of the British Government at the time of the Declaration of Independence, whereas the Cardinal's argument ranks his with those immortal names "that were not born to die." "The State," says Professor Fisher, "has a right to guard its own existence, and to provide for what is essential to its well-being." But that was just the argument of that bigger State, the British Government: Taxation of the Colonies is essential to my well-being, and I must have the taxes. The Colonies replied: They infringe on our natural rights, our inalienable rights, and you cannot have them. So the Professor says for the State: Taxation for "unsectarianism" is essential to our existence and well-being, and we must have these taxes. The Cardinal speaks for parents and children: Taxes for "unsectarianism" infringe upon our natural and inalienable rights, and you are not going to have them. Burke and Chatham, and other friends of the British Government, told them they were deceived by false reasoners; that unjust taxation of the Colonies was not essential to the existence

or the well-being of the mother country, but fraught with danger to both. So, too, speak all true friends of our country to-day: No unjust taxation for "unsectarianism" can be essential to the existence and well-being of the Republic, but must jeopardize both. And in this they but re-echo the words of Washington, reduced to their logical conclusion. For he said: No morality, no State; no religion, no morality; and all say: "Unsectarianism," no religion.

But the Professor says: "The State, as really as the family, is a divine institution." Yes, it is. *Non est potestas nisi a Deo*. But the family was before the State; and the State was instituted, not for the injury of families, but for their good. But the good of families consists in having their natural and inalienable rights respected, not in their destruction. Therefore, the natural rights of families and individuals must determine the limits of civil power, of the rights of the State. Pointing to these limits as the boundary between the two rights, the heads of families and the members composing them can rightly say to the State: "Thus far, and no further." Here the natural law, echo of the eternal law, has securely entrenched us in its inviolable sanctuaries, our homes. Let the learned Professor know that the State is for the people, not the people for the State; that the good of the people is the end of the State, happiness the end of the people; that the happiness of man consists in his perfection as man, and perfection in the possession and enjoyment of the good that perfects him as a rational being. Shut out the *Summum Bonum*, the Infinite Good, from his view, from his hope, from his fruition, and man is bereft of happiness now and always. But this is done by "unsectarianism." Who, then, takes the more reasonable and philanthropic view of the public-school question, the Cardinal or the Professor? Let logic, reason, common sense decide. Nobody denies that families and parents have duties to the State. For rights and duties are correlative, and one connotes the other when the relations between man and man are in question; and he only can justly claim his rights from others who faithfully renders his duties to them.

Another of the Professor's arguments: "The second thing to be said is, that what the Cardinal and his adherents are really contending for is not the rights of the family and of the parent, but the moral right of the clergy to prescribe to the parent and the family how much and what sort of instruction the children shall receive." The Professor is again mistaken. There is no need of contending for a right conceded. But the moral right of the clergy to "prescribe to the parent and the family how much and what sort of instruction the children shall receive" in what appertains to faith and morals, is conceded wherever Christianity, as handed down

from the Apostles, is admitted—wherever the Catholic Church extends. This right is involved in the very name Apostles. They were sent by One having “all power in heaven and in earth” (St. Matth. xxviii., 18). In receiving their mission, the Apostles received their right. What right? Hear the Divine Founder of Christianity: “Go teach all nations” (Americans were not excluded) “teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (St. Matth., xxviii., 19). The Apostles then had the right to “prescribe to the parent and the family how much and what sort of instruction the children shall receive” in regard to the Christian religion, in regard to faith and morals, what to believe, and how to regulate their actions. This right had to be admitted, or the Christian religion could not be accepted. It is part and parcel of Christianity. Without it we could neither have Scripture nor Tradition. Deny this right to the Apostles, and Christianity is not Christianity; no divine institution, but a huge imposture, the outcome of outrageous usurpation. But the lawful successors of the Apostles were and are invested with the same rights as the Apostles. Therefore, the bishops and priests in the Church of Christ to-day, the clergy in the Catholic Church, the *Ecclesia Docens*, have the acknowledged right to teach both parent and family “to observe all things whatsoever” Jesus Christ commanded the Apostles. Not only have they the right, but the duty is incumbent on them to teach the doctrine of Christ. “Go, teach,” are the terms of a positive command. The Divine command must be obeyed. It is the source, and origin, and foundation of all duties. Now, there is this difference between a right and a duty. The right may sometimes be foregone; the claiming of it is not obligatory. A duty can never be omitted; its performance is always obligatory. Hence, the Apostles Peter and John, when threatened by the Jews and charged “not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus,” answered: “If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard” (Acts iv., 19 and 20). And St. Paul says: “A necessity lieth upon me: for woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel” (Cor. i., ix., 16). Therefore, it is for “the rights of the family and of the parent” alone that the Cardinal is contending. The other right is conceded. And this right leaves parents perfectly free to teach their children what and how they please, only guarding with great care the precious deposit of the faith once delivered to the Apostles, reminding all that “the just man liveth by faith,” and “without faith it is impossible to please God” (Heb. xi., 6).

The objection to taxing citizens for the education of children not their own is very nicely disposed of by our logical Professor

in this wise: Citizens are taxed for making roads they may never travel, for building light-houses they may never use; why not then contribute toward the education of their neighbors' children, even though they be richer than the taxed themselves? "As if," he writes, "the vital interests of the entire community are not likewise the interests of the individual, which he is bound, as a member of the community, to foster and protect by contributing his proper share to the cost of securing them."

How can "unsectarianism," we ask, be of any, not to say vital, interest, since, according to Washington, it ruins the community? For "unsectarianism" leaves out religion, therefore morality, therefore the security of the community. Or is it because supported by taxation that it becomes of vital interest? Then, was the notorious "tax upon tea" of vital interest to the Colonies. But a century has proved that they can live without it. At this rate of reasoning it is enough to say of any system of oppression: It is supported by taxation, and must therefore be among the "vital interests of the community."

But Prof. Fisher says "there is no tax which Americans, as a rule, north or south, east or west, pay with more readiness than the school-tax." *O immensa simplicitas!* Mr. Professor, how many denominational schools have these same taxpayers built? How many children frequent them? Count them, and then say if they gladly pay taxes to build schools they never use, to pay teachers they will not have? Do not say that the only opposition to the public schools comes from the clergy, that we may not expose the "flimsy character of this logic." The clergy explain to the people what is sound in faith and right in morals. Therefore, they are the only people in favor of wholesome food at table in families, the only enemies to poisonous admixtures. The people freely accept the clergy, as they do the Christian religion. If they voluntarily take them for their guides in matters of faith and morals, their acts are still their own quite as much as if they were led by "unsectarianism."

Another flourish: "To one who was born and bred in New England, or has had the opportunity to see the working of our school system in other parts of the land, it seems strange to be called upon to defend it. It is like undertaking to prove that the sunshine is beneficial, and that the invigorating breezes that blow over our hills and plains are of use to the human beings who dwell upon them."

What a wonderfully strong argument this against the Cardinal, who quotes from Americans themselves. Has neither Mr. White nor Mr. Montgomery "had the opportunity to see the working of our school system"? It appears they have seen too much of it.

"The confounding of consequent with effect—the *propter hoc* with the *post hoc*," which the Professor claims to detect in the Cardinal's argument, is a prominent feature in his own reply. The nation has been making wonderful progress coexistently with the public schools; therefore, it was owing to them that it did so. As well say: The sun has mounted high in the heavens while covered with clouds; therefore, the clouds have brought it to its zenith.

The Professor does not want to argue from effects to causes. He denies the validity of statistics. He does not want to examine the system *a priori* on its own intrinsic merits. What, then, does he do? He calls on General F. A. Walker to help him bolster up a limping cause. Here is how the General reasons: He is comparing Massachusetts with "another State." "So far, then," these are his words, "the paucity of the prison lists of the latter State simply represents the toleration of vice, if not of crime." That is, Massachusetts has a larger prison list; therefore, it is in that proportion more free from crime, a more moral State. This is using statistics with a vengeance. To make the people moral, he makes the laws tyrannical or ridiculous. If they are moral, why imprison them? If they are imprisoned, how are they moral? Either, then, the rulers or the ruled are not what they ought to be. This defence is worse than none for the public-school system. Where is logic gone all this time?

Professor Fisher says: "It is true that the strongest incentives to the practice of morality are the motives presented in the religion of the Gospel." Why not, then, give our youth the strongest incentives to the practice of morality, by substituting denominational schools, where the religion of the Gospel can be taught, for your public schools as at present conducted? Are you afraid that our youth will grow up too moral? Is virtue so easy to be acquired and practised that the smallest inducement will suffice, if, indeed, any is wanted?

Regarding text-books, the Professor says: "Mr. Gladstone, in his plan for universities in Ireland, proposed to exclude from the course of study philosophy and history. A university without these two studies would be like a man without eyes." But why did Mr. Gladstone propose to leave them out? Was he so blind as not to see that a blind university was not what it ought to be? No. But that very shrewd man saw that he had of two evils to choose the lesser. He could not have either of these branches in a school intended for Catholics and Protestants. It would be like trying to harmonize day and night. But what Mr. Gladstone esteems worse than blindness, Prof. Fisher thinks is good enough for our American schools. To be sure, in a university, where the comparatively matured judgment of students may be presumably taken as toler-

ably competent to make due discrimination in reading history, a one-sided view is extremely dangerous; but in the elementary public schools, and even high schools, there is not the least danger of distorting facts. And as to philosophy in these latter schools, its influence, first on the teacher's mind, and then through him on the minds of his pupils, must count for naught; and it matters not whether it be transcendental, agnostic, pantheistic, or positivist, provided it be not formally taught, "save possibly in the rudiments," and that only "in the high school."

Blindness will not do for a school, says the learned Professor. Better that than worse, said Mr. Gladstone. So, whichever way you fix it, it is either blindness or worse than blindness, in regard to two important studies in the undenominational or "unsectarian" system. We say, we want neither blindness nor worse than blindness. Give each denomination its own schools, and be just to all.

The closing argument of the Professor, his clincher, is an appeal to politicians. "The only hope of the adversary," he writes, "must lie in the desire of politicians to catch votes; and these will soon learn, if they do not know by instinct, that in taking wrong ground on this vital question they will lose vastly more votes than they can hope to win."

The learned Professor forgets what he had stated a few pages back, "that there is no tax which Americans, as a rule, north or south, east or west, pay with more readiness than the school-tax." Again: "To one who . . . has the opportunity to see the working of our school system in other parts of the land, it seems strange to be called upon to defend it. It is like undertaking to prove that the sunshine is beneficial, and that the invigorating breezes that blow over our hills and plains are of use to the human beings who dwell upon them."

If the people throughout the length and breadth of the land are most ready to pay the school-tax, if they see that the public schools are beneficial as the sunshine, useful as the invigorating breezes, what necessity to threaten politicians with loss of votes if they do not commit themselves to the defense of the system? Why not leave them free in a free republic to act conscientiously and according to their convictions for the public good, for the general welfare, for the best interests of the whole community? Not so does the Cardinal, not so do we do. We appeal to the right reason, the good sense, the highest interests of the people themselves, of the heads and the members of families, to claim their "natural and inalienable right to pursue happiness." The full measure of happiness, the highest and greatest attainable in this life, consists in virtue as taught by Christianity; and a virtuous life opens the

door to infinite and eternal happiness. But this virtue cannot subsist without the succors of religion (the Christian religion). Religious training cannot, therefore, be excluded from our schools without shutting out youth first, and manhood afterward, and at the same time the parents of the youth, from their "inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness."

THE ANGLICAN BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

THE "trial" of the Bishop of Lincoln, as it has been somewhat erroneously styled, has not excited that degree of public interest which so great an event seemed to promise. Had such a trial taken place fifty years ago—just on the eve of the birth of the new Puseyism—it would have set all thinking Englishmen "by the ears." In these days we are too accustomed to the battles of the Ritualists with their bishops, their parishioners, and the Privy Council to feel much surprise because one more turn of the wheel of fortune has put a bishop into the position of defendant. It is thought to be rather curious than scandalizing. Besides, we have grown familiar with the pictures in the shop windows of the Bishop of Lincoln in full pontificals; so that the "trial" is but a step in the progress of an enthusiast towards what he considers to be perfection. Events have been leading up to it for many years. Sooner or later a bishop would be prosecuted. Yet it is curious that no provision against this accident was thought of by Parliament or by Convocation. A bishop can veto an action against a rector; but an archbishop cannot veto an action against a bishop. This was an oversight. A clause in the Act of Parliament would have enabled His Grace of Canterbury to save himself all this trouble and responsibility.

To judge of the "absurdity" of this trial—using the word "absurd" in the Euclid sense—let us put back the date of it fifty years. Say that we are in the year 1839, and let us see how a trial of a Bishop of Lincoln for adopting certain "Roman Catholic" rites and ceremonies would have appeared to the guileless Protestants of that time. The imagination will sometimes help us to see the absurdity of a position more quickly and more securely than will dry reason. We will go back then to the year 1839; and we will

bear in mind that it is the *same* Church which is now prosecuting the Bishop of Lincoln for being, familiarly speaking, "a Roman Catholic," which in 1839 looked on Roman Catholicity as an impossibility from an Anglican or, indeed, from an English point of view.

The present writer may be pardoned if he speaks from his own recollections of what the Church of England was in 1839. By the 'Church of England he means that idea and that fact which were present to the minds of the Protestant nation. That idea and that fact were a national institution, most admirably adapted to British needs. The Church of England was respectable, it was comfortable. It did not oblige us to do anything that was penitential, nor to believe in anything that annoyed our private judgment. [The present writer is speaking of his Protestant days.] It proposed to us the beautiful sentiment of Christianity, but did not harass us with definitions of doctrine. The creeds were the literary ballast of the institution, but the real religion of Anglicanism was its sentiment; and a very beautiful sentiment it was. No one who knew the English mind of fifty years ago could deny that the beautiful sentiment of Christianity was firmly planted in the deepest heart of the whole nation, and that the very wrath of the popular mind against "Romanism" was based on the assumption that it "lowered Christ." Fantastic, or even imbecile, as such an assumption might be, there it was in the minds of the huge majority; and the assumption made the National Church Protestant. At the present day it is almost impossible for a young Catholic to understand what the force was in 1839 of the word Protestant. It meant a deep fear, a deep loathing, of Popery. Though a negative, it was a positive, frame of mind. To protest was the doctrinal armory of the faithful Christian. Without protest there could, of course, be no Protestantism; and was not Protestantism the pure religion of the Bible? Hence, Protestantism necessarily involved "no sacerdotalism." The clergy were not called priests, they were called ministers. The laity were not obedient, they were respectful. The public worship was not "Mass," it was "service." The altar—there was no such thing; there was a communion table. The whole idea was that of a religion that was divine, protected by a church that was human. And the protector-church did its duty unflinchingly. Its postulate was "No Popery"; and all its teaching, its preaching, even its praying, were grounded on that supreme national negative. With perfect consistency the Church of England stripped her communion tables of every ornament save the clergymen's large prayer-books. With perfect consistency she put her big pulpits and big prayer-desks right in front of her meagre-looking communion tables, to show

that preaching was more important than "taking the sacrament"; she hid her fonts away in corners or even in vestries, lest the simple folk should think too much of baptism; she made her clergy to preach in black gowns, not in white ones, lest their garb should even hint at sacerdotalism; she put a lay clerk into a little box under the reading desk, whose duty it was to make the responses for the congregation, so that she might teach the laity that they came to church to hear sermons and not, primarily, to take part in the form of prayer; she filled her churches with hideous pews—not open seats—well furnished with comfortable cushions, comfortable hassocks, and closed in with bolted doors, not even latched doors—for strict privacy and a sort of assured domestic peace; and she left the poor only to sit where they could find room, on open benches without cushions, without hassocks, so that they might practise publicly the beautiful virtue of humility while the clergyman was preaching it from the pulpit.

Now we have supposed, we are supposing, that in those days of the Church of England, about the year 1839, and in the Victorian era, a Bishop of Lincoln had been prosecuted for that almost only Protestant heresy, the imitating of the forms and ceremonies of the Church of Rome. Well, this is to imagine what is absolutely unimaginable. Such a thing could not possibly have been. No bishop was in those days even a Puseyite, and as to Ritualism, it had never been heard of. Ceremonial was a practice attributed to foreign Papists. The "Reformation" had wiped it out from Protestant England. To hate ceremonies, to hate forms, symbols, suggestiveness, was a corollary of the proved iniquity of being "Romanizing." As to a cross, had a clergyman put one into his church—but no, he would as soon have thought of putting a crucifix. As to "genuflecting at the altar"—in the first place, there was no altar, and, in the next place, there was not anything to which to genuflect. Had a clergyman in those days "genuflected to the elements"; had he presumed to turn his back upon the people; had he lit a candle on the communion table, or even placed there a candle that was not lit; had he worn any vestment save a surplice, varied only by his university or preaching gown; had he done anything, in short, which Anglican clergymen do now, he would have been regarded as "not responsible for his actions." The "appeal" would not have been to a trial, it would have been to a doctor learned in lunacy. No such clerical eccentricity was ever imagined; still less was it ever experimented or perpetrated. And so, too, as to preaching: a sermon on the Real Presence, on confession, or even on fasting,—save only to "protest" against such Popery,—would have been regarded as an indication that the preacher was of unsound mind, and perhaps his wife would

have been kindly spoken to on the subject. Even if a preacher went so far as to hint that baptism might possibly be accompanied by regeneration, he was thought to be treading on delicate ground, and the next Sunday he might find it prudent to compromise. A young curate, in the year 1840, did go so far as to say in a sermon that "the Roman Catholic Church was to be commended for insisting on the importance of doctrine; and it would be well if, in the Church of England, there were more insistance on it"; a sentence which he was requested to qualify on the following Sunday, as it seemed to imply that the Roman Church *could* teach doctrine. Exactly as the ceremonial was forbidden, so was the definite doctrine ignored, save only on the broad truths of Redemption, to deny which would have been to deny Christianity. The positive side of the teaching was wholly limited to those broad truths, but the negative side,—much the stronger side of the two,—was inclusive of the passionate denial of all that approximated to "Romanism," of all such views as implied a Christian priesthood, an altar, a consecration, a sacrifice, or of whatever assumed authority to be connected with ministry, or powers to be connected with ordination.

This Anglican Church, then, of the year 1839, was either the same Church as is that of 1889, or else is was another and a contrary Church. If it was the same Church, then it is obvious that the Bishop of Lincoln may well plead the absurdity of prosecuting him, since *most* of the Anglican clergymen of the present day present a doctrine as well as a ritual to their flocks which are much more distinct from those presented fifty years ago than are *his* doctrine and ritual from *theirs*. But if the Church of 1839 was a different and a contrary Church—bearing only the same relations to the State—then is the prosecution equally absurd; because the Church of England of to-day cannot possibly be that Church of England which was manufactured by Queen Elizabeth out of thin air, if it had no corporate existence in 1839; any more than it can be the same Church which Pope Gregory paternally governed a thousand years before Queen Elizabeth died. The Bishop of Lincoln might well ask the Archbishop of Canterbury,—before whose judgment seat he was originally summoned,—"Which Church does your Grace happily preside over? Is it the Church of Pope Gregory or of Queen Elizabeth; the Church of 1839 or of 1889; the Church of no altar, no priesthood, no ritual, or the Church which to-day insists on all three? Your Grace is more to be pitied than I am; for, whereas I have only to answer for myself, and can only represent my own theology, Your Grace has to answer for at least three Churches, each and all of which you are supposed to represent."

But the Bishop of Lincoln has not taken this playful line. It would be difficult to state his line with perfect fairness. Indeed, he has necessarily taken two lines—his legal line as a defendant in an action, and his personal line as a champion of "Catholic truth." As a defendant, he has had the advantage of a first-rate counsel, the learned and the High Church Sir Walter Phillimore. But let us speak first of his personal line, and see if we can make it out as a would-be logical combination of two opposites. He has written letters during his trial to many who condoled with him; and almost everybody has condoled with him from personal regard. He has written to one friend: "It is gratifying to me that the workingmen of England are beginning to understand what the Church of England is." If they do understand this, they must be wiser than their betters, wiser than the Archbishop of Canterbury or Sir Walter Phillimore, wiser than the Church Association (which was the prosecutor), and wiser than the English Church Union, which cannot succeed in uniting Anglicans in one belief. Further, the Bishop has written: "The workingmen of England see that, in the Church of England, God has given them their inheritance in the Catholic Church." This is puzzling. Does it mean that the Church of England is the Catholic Church? If so, the first note of Catholicity must be tumultuousness in the discordancy of its sects. Or does it mean that Catholicity includes Anglicanism? If so, what can it possibly exclude? For even the two Anglican Communion of 1839, 1889, can boast of nothing in common but State dependence. But, again, the Bishop writes: "In the Church of England we find that rest to head and heart which no rank or wealth can command, and with which no earthly blessing can compare." "Rest to head and heart!" And this, too, at the very moment when the Bishop is taking his trial for trying to imitate Catholic worship, and trying to teach some Catholic doctrines. Finally, the Bishop piously hopes that the result of his trial may be that the English people "will know more and more the blessings which God has provided for them in the English Church." If they do not know those "blessings" already, they must be slow of apprehension and acquirement. Now, everybody has been made aware that Dr. King, Bishop of Lincoln, is a most superior and most amiable gentleman. We may therefore say, respectfully, that we wish he were well out of the muddle which his anomalous Anglican position imposes on him. He is too good for the rôle he has chosen to play. He has no more right to be in the Church of England than in Methodism. His sympathies are with everything which the Church of England has always repudiated, and opposed to everything which the Church of England has always approved. True, there have always been a few Anglican divines who have ad-

vocated what are called High Church doctrines; but there have been none who have worn chasubles, none who have "said Mass," none who have publicly carried the episcopal crozier—or have had it carried before them by a chaplain—none who have posed as "real, live Catholic bishops," to quote the jaunty expression of a daily paper. High Churchism was only an abstract ideal, a hypothesis, a theory to be argued in Anglican quarterlies, up to the time when the "Tracts for the Times" were begun. Dr. King is the first Anglican bishop who has made the *mis-en-scène* of Catholic worship to be didactic of Catholic doctrine in Protestant churches. He has "turned Papist without becoming one," as a writer put it in a letter to the London *Chronicle*. He might as well address His Grace of Canterbury as "Your Holiness" as play at being a Catholic bishop in Protestant churches.

As a defendant in a legal quarrel forced upon him, he has taken perhaps a more tenable position. Yet no human being can sincerely care two straws whether an Anglican bishop should be tried, in the first instance, before the Archbishop of Canterbury with his assessors, or before the bishops of the Province of Canterbury, assembled under the Queen's writ in Convocation. Such a bone of contention could only be "matter for delay." In the Established Church the final appeal in spiritual causes always was and always will be the temporal courts; the Privy Council being, so to speak, the Anglican Holy See with which rests the ultimate decision. And every one knows—every one knew at the beginning—that each and all the practices for which the bishop was arraigned had already been condemned by this tribunal, had been declared unlawful by the Supreme Head of the Establishment, speaking through her council in Whitehall. The particular stages, therefore, by which the Privy Council might be reached were more interesting to lawyers than to clergymen. But what said Sir Walter Phillimore in his learned pleading? He proved by numerous instances that, in the old pre-"Reformation" times, bishops were not removed by temporal courts, but by the Pope, to whom they had promised obedience. Speaking of an episcopal trial in the sixteenth century, after the "Reformation" had begun its work, Sir Walter said: "The High Commission had, or assumed to have, just exactly the same powers which it claimed the king had, and it claimed that the king had all the powers that the Pope had. Therefore the fact of the High Commission assuming to deprive bishops does not in the least point to the fact that the Archbishop had the power; it only points to the fact that the Pope had the power." And what was true of the King's commission in the sixteenth century, is true of the Queen's council in the nineteenth century. Henry VIII., by special statute, granted an appeal to himself, or

to persons whom he should appoint to represent himself, "for lack of justice in any of the courts of the Archbishops in this realm"; and no one has denied that the same principle is still in force, and must govern the case of the Bishop of Lincoln. The Ritualists may wish that it were otherwise. Neither the queen nor her Parliament will oblige them.

Yet it is difficult to help a smile at the fact that Sir Walter Phillimore has striven throughout the whole of his learned pleading to unite the present Church of England with the pre-"Reformation" Church, as though the two Churches were one and the same Church. We can only rejoice that the learned counsel has fully proved that the Church of England, up to the time of the royal "Reformer," Henry VIII., always recognized the deposing power of the Pope, whereas, since then, she has always conformed to the civil power. Quoting the cases of several bishops who had been deposed, subsequent to the time of the Norman conquest, but previous to the time of the "Reformation," Sir Walter Phillimore affirmed that in each instance they had been "deposed by Papal Legate duly commissioned, and not by the English Metropolitan." Now it happens that Sir Walter Phillimore is himself a prominent member of what is called the English Church Union; so that one does not see how that Union can assert that there has always existed a separate Anglican communion or "Church of England" apart from the communion of the Pope; since no English bishop up to the time of the Reformation was ever out of communion with the Holy See. If the two Churches now called Roman and Anglican were (admittedly) the same Church before the "Reformation," but are (admittedly) two Churches now, how is it to be contended that the present Archbishop of Canterbury is Metropolitan of the same Church as were his predecessors? Sir Walter Phillimore was obliged to argue on the hypothesis that the two Churches *used* to be one and the same Church; yet he satisfactorily proved the "absurdity" of the position which he was forced to take up for argument's sake.

And now let us turn to the popular estimate in England of the real importance, the real gravity of the trial. Let us ask: What do "the public" think on the three points which are being principally discussed—the bishop's offence, the courts that try him, and the likely issue? There are, of course, different "schools" of British critics. We will classify them briefly, but sufficiently. And first, we will take the pretentiously superior school, represented by the *Saturday Review*. "The conduct of the Church Association (which prosecuted the Bishop of Lincoln) is," says the *Saturday Review*, "regarded with unqualified reprobation and disgust by every man in these kingdoms who combines honesty, intelligence, and loyalty

to the Anglican Church." Well, that is straightforward. But now as to the real value of the appeal in so far as it can issue in good or evil. "There is a large body—with whom we agree on the whole—who think that the hitherto decisions on subjects and cases kindred to this have been for the most part deplorably wrong in fact, in law, and in logic." This does not say much for the value of an appeal, even assuming that it should be carried on to a final judgment. But are the Ritualists right or wrong in their present attitude? The *Saturday Review* is quite unable to tell us. It can only say that *some* Ritualists seem to "aim at the transformation of the Church of England from the greatest example of a true Church, at once Catholic and National, that the world has ever seen, into a narrow dissenting sect—a little more Catholic perhaps in doctrine, but in all other respects not less narrow or sectarian than Baptists or anti-burghers." It would take a week to analyze such a sentence; so we will leave it as an example of "superior" Anglicanism.

The *Spectator* and other organs "beat round about the bush" in a similarly unsatisfactory sort of way. But the most interesting—and, we may also say, the most amusing—part of the controversy is the variety of suggestions which are offered for a *new* Court of Appeal, with the variety of answers which are made to them. Lord Carnarvon heads the list of correspondents who ridicule the idea of any new Court—which Lord Carnarvon calls "the phantom of a new Spiritual Court"—as "fitted rather for Utopia than for modern England," and as only leading us away from the real point at issue, "the vital question, how we can bar the way to religious persecution, and maintain that *comprehension* which is essential to the very existence of the Church of England." This seems common sense. "Comprehension" is the Church of England; or, rather, the Church of England is comprehension. If we were asked to define the Church of England in one word, and yet to do it so scientifically as to defy correction, we should simply write down "Comprehension."

The Dean of Windsor comes next in the list of correspondents who are commanding attention for the breadth of their suggestions. He does not like the Ritualists. They are "thwarting the efforts of the great central body, both lay and clerical, of the Church, for moral, social and religious improvement." This seems severe. We should take a much more favorable view of the Ritualists. They have done more to introduce earnestness into the Church of England, in the way both of parochial work and church attendance, than all the other Anglican sects put together.

But what say the High Church "religious" newspapers, for example, the *Church Review*, the *Church Times*? Let us try to

be perfectly fair in representing them. Says the *Church Review*: "Our contention is that God has, through Christ, given to the Apostles and their successors, the bishops and priests of the Church, the duty of ruling His kingdom on earth, and that we may not, from any motive whatever, give that duty to any other body in the world. . . . Let us have no more litigation until the Church's courts have been re-erected, and a Court of Appeal has been found to satisfy Church and State, and all may yet be well." As this supposes a solution which will never be realized—which, in the very nature of things cannot be realized—and which, if it were realized, would leave out of the question the fact that the Church of England, for three centuries, has been devoid of any spiritual Court of Appeal, we cannot commend it as either practical or sincere. But, on the other hand, we can most cordially agree with the *Church Review* that anything more fantastically inconsistent or "absurd"—as Euclid would have truthfully expressed it—than to prosecute a bishop for mediævalism, while leaving hundreds of clergymen to deny Christian verities with equal audacity and impunity, has not been known, even in the inconsistent Church of England.

We need not stay to quote the *Church Times*, which writes in a similar vein to that of the *Church Review*, but we will next quote a newspaper which represents the Low Church party, or rather the lowest possible section of that party. Says the *Rock*:

"The trial of the Bishop of Lincoln is doing good, in that it is forcing the Ritualists to show their hand, and is opening the eyes of Englishmen to the real character of the Ritualist conspiracy. Doubtless there are High Churchmen and Advanced Churchmen who would hail a Church Court of their own creation, and would abide by its decisions. But the majority of their party will agree to nothing short of a surrender to them all along the line. Even then they would be restless; for they have so long been a law to themselves they would never bow to rule or ruler, save to their own sweet will. In their very ritual each church or section of churches has its peculiar ritual, and some in their vestments and services are Roman, some are Anglican of a mediæval type. Place them in ascendancy, and they will begin to tear each other's throats as vigorously as they have hitherto been rending the Church of England. Wilfulness and disloyalty are a passion, and speedily become a habit."

This passage may be quoted as showing the "unity" of the Church of England; though beyond its value in that one groove of demonstration, we should be sorry to look upon it as "Anglican." We may rather prefer the sarcastic vein of the Dean of Windsor, who has said to the whole body of the Ritualists, "Name any tribunal you *would* accept." This challenge has been taken up by the religious newspapers; but they find a difficulty in agreeing to an answer. They want a spiritual court, yet they dread it; because they know that the great majority of bishops, deans, and archdeacons, and—as is always certain to be the case—that the

Archbishops of Canterbury and York would be opposed to all extravagances in Ritualism. So the religious newspapers try to "hedge" their admissions. The truth is, they are in an insoluble dilemma. If they take the *judicial* functions from the State and transfer them to the two houses of Convocation, or if they take the *legislative* functions from the State and transfer them to the same Anglican two houses, they are in this plight: that a decision once given as to doctrine or as to ritual would amount to a sort of *causa finita est*. And imagine a *causa finita est* in the Church of England! This would mean the investing of the houses of Convocation (judicially) with what would practically be the imputation of infallibility; it would be, in short, a transference of the *imperium* of private judgment to the *imperium* of a pseudo-Catholic authority. But this would mean the transferring of *all* Protestantism to a pseudo or home-made kind of Catholicity; such a Catholicity meaning simply the opinion of Convocation, *minus* Pontiff, *minus* Council, *minus* Christendom. The Church newspapers see this. They are therefore "cornered" by the Dean of Windsor, who asks bluntly: "Name any tribunal you *would* accept." They would rather not name any tribunal. The Catholicity of Anglicanism does not admit of tribunals, which would smash up Ritualism quite as much as Low Churchism. So the church newspapers write cautiously as to the necessity of a spiritual court; and while deploring the just charge of *anomia* which is brought against Anglicanism as it is, only beg for some "qualified" tribunal, "endowed by the united Convocations of Canterbury and York with spiritual jurisdiction." This is obviously unreal. Whence would the united Convocations get their power of conferring jurisdiction? They must be pre-supposed to have jurisdiction, if they could confer it. If they have it, whence did they get it? Neither Queen Elizabeth nor Queen Victoria has ever been credited with a spiritual power to confer what they could not possibly possess; so that unless some new fountain of jurisdiction were discovered, bubbling up out of the waters of tribulation, we cannot even imagine whence the "endowment" is to proceed which the "united houses" are presumed to be able to "pass on." No wonder there is a shyness in the Church newspapers. It is one thing to deplore *anomia*, but another to remedy it. Would it not be better—more honest—to say outright: "We are Anglicans; we like to do things in our amateur way; so please leave us alone to have a state trial now and then, which will give us the appearance of being martyrs, though it will really only increase our importance."

Meanwhile, let us speak in praise of one good argument of the Ritualists, who are now contending both with the State and with Low Churchmen. They say to their opponents: Why should

you not prosecute the Dean of Westminster for allowing images of the Blessed Virgin and her Divine Child to be "restored" to the north transept of Westminster Abbey, the dean having actually authorized the restoration? Or why should you not prosecute the Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral for allowing his "priests" to turn their backs upon the people, to genuflect before their consecrated elements, and generally to behave themselves in a way which fifty years ago would have been regarded as indicating insanity? Well, the reason why you do not prosecute them, say the Ritualists, is because the *doctrines* which are preached at Westminster and at St. Paul's are so painfully broad or indefinite that no one could suspect the clergy of being "Catholics." Every one knows the symbolism to be only æsthetic—the mere prettiness of the official temples of state Protestantism.

But to return to the bishop's trial: is there *no* good to be got out of it? Yes, it must lead to a large number of conversions. Let us suppose the only two possible issues: the bishop will be pronounced innocent or guilty. How can either issue lead to conversions?

First, let us suppose the bishop to be condemned. Then, in the words of Lord Halifax, "the archbishop will have ruled the sacramental principle out of the Church," or will have decided that "there is no sacerdotal character in her clergy." It is tolerably certain that the Bishop of Lincoln would not "appeal," since his appeal could be made only to the Privy Council. The subject, therefore, would drop. And how would the Ritualist party accept the issue? They would have got what they always said they desired to get, a judgment on ritual by a spiritual court. Would they submit? Would they give up all that they have been fighting for during twenty years? Is it likely that, being a powerful party, which has won its victories by sheer insistence on its own will against bishops as well as against laity, it is going to yield everything at a first rebuff, obtained, remember, at the request of extreme Protestants? True, there is this difficulty: that the condemnation would make it impossible for Anglican bishops to veto future actions against Ritualists; so that one result would be an enormous increase in litigation; a sort of chronic crusade of Ritualism against the bishops. But this would not make most Ritualists unhappy. They would rather like to be in perpetual hot water. Next to commanding the Anglo-Catholic Church, they would enjoy perpetual warfare against its commanders. Of course, we are not speaking of the sincere Ritualists, but of that very large body which looks on contention as martyrdom, or which likes the formula, "*L'Eglise, c'est moi.*"

But take the other hypothesis: Say the court pronounced in

favor of the bishop. Is it likely that the Protestant Church Association would rest content with such an injurious decision? They would immediately carry the case "on appeal" to the Judicial Committee and would beg for a reversion of the judgment. Would they get it? We may regard it as almost certain that they would do so. For, in the first place, were the Judicial Committee to even consent to re-hear the case, it would be consenting to reconsider a variety of practices upon which it had already given judgment. There is nothing that is positively new in the bishop's case, scarcely anything that has not been included in past judgments. Such details as are new are unimportant. We can hardly suppose, then, that the Judicial Committee would approve the decision of "the court below," since this would be to make the State say to the Church: "We bow to the spiritual court as to our superior, and humbly accept the fatherly correction it has given us;" a not very likely attitude for that Church-creating English State which has pursued precisely the opposite course for three centuries. But, say that the State took another line—a very much more likely and consistent line—and simply ordered the archbishop to reverse his judgment and to proceed to condemn the Bishop of Lincoln. This would create two "pretty quarrels," the State *versus* the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of Canterbury *versus* himself. If the archbishop should refuse to obey the State, the State would pass the judgment of its own accord; at least, it would cause its decision to be known, even if it did not proceed to judgment. But if the archbishop should consent to pass the judgment, and should thus stultify his own court and his own conscience—but no! such a thing would be quite impossible; self-respect would render obedience out of the question. Anyway, whatever turn the trial may take, it must demonstrate the sectarianism of the Church of England. All earnest men will have pursued the subject to the bitter end, and will have learned at last that the Church of England cannot be Catholic.

It is for this reason that we look for many conversions to the Church from the "revelation" which this "august trial" must afford. In truth, the comedy of the "august trial" should be in itself a revelation to every man whose sense of humor is not paralyzed. How can a religion be both ridiculous and true? When St. Gregory Nazianzen said to some heretics of his time, "Give me leave to be merry on a merry subject," he certainly knew of nothing in his own time so mirth-provoking as the "august trial" of the thoroughly amiable Dr. King. Here we have a bishop of a State-Church, which was created by Queen Elizabeth in the sixteenth century, claiming to be judged by the bishops in convocation, in preference to being judged by his archbishop; while all the

while his own counsel is pleading *before* the archbishop, that, up to the time of Queen Elizabeth, the Pope alone decided questions about bishops. This same counsel insists on quoting authorities for his opinions, which authorities lived in purely Catholic times; so that at one and the same moment he contends that the Church of England is the same Church as was the Church of St. Gregory, of St. Anselm, of St. Edmund, of St. Thomas Becket, and yet that the jurisdiction was solely Pontifical in their days, while in these days it is solely Anglican or political. We will not go through the *catena* of "absurdities," which we should wish that "Euclid" could have neatly expressed for us in corollaries. To keep only to the one point of jurisdiction: *Ex nihilo nihil fit*, seems a very safe postulate; and can any Anglican even so much as hazard a conjecture as to whence jurisdiction *could* have come to Convocation, any more than to the Archbishop of Canterbury? Where was the source? Where the beginning? There is, of course, all the difference in the world between a disciplinary and a doctrinal tribunal; the former might play any pranks that it pleased; it could only persecute, only enforce, it could not teach. But as to a doctrinal tribunal, unless it begin with Divine authority, unless it can trace its Divine origin and can prove it, no man would be in his senses who should permit it to dictate to him, saying: "This shall you believe, and nothing else." Now let us grant to Convocation the disciplinary power. [It has it not; but let us suppose that it may gain it.] What would this have to do with its power of teaching doctrine, of "dogmatizing" about this or that heresy? For, of course, we all know—though the subject is not pressed, because it would be inconvenient to press it—that these questions about ritual are really questions about doctrine, questions about *all* that is meant by "priesthood." They are questions about sacrifice, about holy communion, about absolution, about the right or wrong *credo* of the Catholic Christian. Who gave to the present Anglican Convocation the power to decide any one point of belief, so as to rule it as an article of the faith? Is it heresy to believe this, to deny that? and if so, by what authority does Convocation affirm, when ruling, that a particular tenet is heretical? "Convocation has spoken, the cause is ended?" We know that no Anglican can answer the question. So the only way of evading the whole difficulty is to assume that the teaching-power is not required; because, the early councils having settled every doctrine, all we can now want to know is the right ritual.

This is evasion. It purposely ignores the whole question of a living Divine authority, as distinct from a fossilized establishment. It purposely ignores such a variety of questions as *when* was the Church a teaching Church? *how* did it come to lose the power to teach? *why* should it not now be required to teach? or *who* says

that it ought not now to wish to teach? Seeing that there is much more heresy now in the world than there ever was [in England alone there are 250 sects], it follows that there must be much more need now than there ever was for a Divine, that is, an infallible, teacher. "No," say Anglicans; "no such need can exist, for the simple reason that the Church of England is not infallible." A very pretty answer, indeed; not unlike the answer of a sea-captain who should affirm: "There can be no necessity for a ship to have a rudder, because my ship can get on the rocks without one." So, as Anglicans will not hear of a teaching Church, they fall back on a spiritual interpreter of Church rubrics; and, as they have not got one, they grow wroth with the Privy Council, which kindly offers to do the work for them, when requested. Gravely, we cannot see why the Privy Council should not perform such a purely critical task with due efficiency. If the Privy Council were asked to settle a question of doctrine,—to rule an article of the Anglican faith for Anglicans only,—there might be reasonable objection that the clergy were the best judges of what suited the tastes and prejudices of the British public. But in a mere matter of an interpretation of a ritual-rubric, a lawyer should do it as well as an ecclesiastic. The truth is that the jumble of the whole matter arises from not stating, fairly and honestly, that what is wanted is not the interpretation of rubrics, but the adapting of old rubrics to new doctrines. The same old-fashioned rubrics have done good service for Evangelicals, through long years before even Puseyism was heard of; no one ever thought of prosecuting an Evangelical because he did not found Roman practices on Protestant rubrics; so that it is late in the day to begin to ask the question, "Cannot these same rubrics, which have always justified ultra Protestantism, be made to justify ultra Ritualistic practices?" We are not surprised that the Privy Council says: "No; they cannot." And we should be surprised, too, if Convocation,—supposing it should ever come to have the power,—should assent to some such strange decretal as the following: "The Anglican rubrics were evidently designed to enforce a theory of worship, which about two centuries of Anglicans have never dreamed of; therefore, as we must approve the Ritualistic theory, we feel it our duty to pass sentence of deprivation on all the clergy who *have* lived during the last two centuries."

"Which is absurd." But who made it so? It is such considerations as these which seem to point to the probability that a number of earnest Ritualists will now "submit." They have held out long enough to justify their consciences in having tried their utmost to believe in the Church of England; but now that it is proved to be "absurd," past all hope of fresh apologies, fresh theories, we believe that many of them will throw off the conventional

mask and see themselves and their "Church" in clear sunlight. The novelty, of course, of the present "trial" is that it is a bishop, not a mere rector, who is being tried. We have shown that, whichever way the trial may issue, its lessons must be equally emphatic; that an approval of the new doctrines would be an anathema on the old Anglicanism; while a condemnation would settle the question of Catholicity. Is it necessary to put such reasonings more amply? What has been said, though, perhaps, only suggestively—for it would take volumes to elaborate each point—amounts, in brief digest, to such an argument as the following, if we can put it into just a very few lines:

(1) Fifty years ago the "trial" would have been impossible; because no bishop ever dreamed of a ritual which should symbolize Catholic, Roman doctrine; on the contrary (2), the Protestantism was so national, so profound, that the *mis-en-scène* of Anglican churches was made to "symbolize" the deep loathing which the whole nation entertained of the thought of Popery. In the same spirit (3) the preaching in Anglican churches was always, primarily, anti-Roman, that is, Protestant; the smallest sympathy with one specifically Roman doctrine being regarded with as much horror as was the Inquisition. Now (4), this Church of, say 1839, was either the same Church as is the Church of 1889, or else it was a different and a contrary Church. If it was the same Church, then two contrary national creeds must necessarily constitute one and the same national Church; but if it was a different Church, then there is no link between "Anglo-Catholicism" and the Church which Queen Elizabeth founded, any more than there is any link between the Church of 1839 and the Catholic Church of, say, the time of Henry VII. But (5) the Bishop of Lincoln has assured us that, in the Church of England, there is the Englishman's "inheritance in the Catholic Church"; so that we are bound to conclude that this "inheritance" has been in abeyance, has been dormant, for the greater part of that Church's existence; and that only quite recently have even Anglican bishops made the discovery that the Church of England has been Catholic without knowing it. Or, to put another interpretation on this Catholicity, the Church of England is equally Catholic when anathematizing Roman doctrines, and when copying them as closely as she can; when turning altars into barren tables (with holy communion once a quarter), churches into pewed barns, priests into ministers, sacrifice into remembrance, seven whole sacraments into two half sacraments, and when decking out her priests in Roman chasubles, and her bishops in Roman mitres, Roman robes, that they may "say Mass," and affect to preach "all Roman doctrine." Such a pleading, utterly staggering as it must seem, is made to gather additional confusion

from the "legal argument"; (6) the bishop's advocate, Sir Walter Phillimore, having urged that the Church in England, up to the time of the so-called Reformation, always referred its episcopal difficulties to the Holy See, which was the sole fountain of spiritual jurisdiction, as well as the sole final authority known to Englishmen up to the time of Henry VIII. From which pleading of the bishop's advocate we are bound to conclude—adopting the Ritualist method of severe reasoning—that the present Archbishop of Canterbury, who not only repudiates the Holy See, but often reads it a lesson in sound doctrine, is Metropolitan of the same Church as was St. Anselm or St. Edmund, and believes all that they believed and that they taught. (7) And when, turning from this strange confusion on the part of the clergy of the Establishment, we asked, what do the laity think of "the trial," we found that the laity (as was natural) were in quite as dire an inextricability as were the pastors and masters of things spiritual. Lord Carnarvon, who believes only in "comprehensiveness," and ridicules the idea of a spiritual court, "as fitted rather for Utopia than for modern England" (an estimate in which we entirely concur), is, practically, in the same mind and in the same muddle as the Dean of Windsor, who asks the Ritualists, "Name any tribunal you *would* accept." The laity are worse off than sheep who have no shepherds, for they are sheep whose various shepherds are always quarreling, and who, still more curiously, have to be taught by the sheep what is the proper rule and method of shepherding. The *Saturday Review*, which calls the Establishment "the greatest example of a true Church, at once Catholic and national, that the world has ever seen"; the *Church Review*, which *waits* for a Court of Appeal which shall satisfy both Church and State"; the *Rock*, which says that the Ritualists, if in ascendancy, "would begin to tear each other's throats as vigorously as they have hitherto been rending the Church of England"; the church lawyers, who cannot find *where* its jurisdiction, nor *whence* it can possibly have been derived, nor *who* can have first given it, or have first withdrawn it; the old-fashioned "good Churchmen," who have no more idea of the difference between a doctrinal and a disciplinary tribunal than they have of the difference between a dogma and a tradition; all these, and numerous other sections of Anglican laity, are howling in the wilderness *with* their shepherds, while the shepherds are howling for themselves more than for the sheep. (8) Finally, whatever the issue of this so-called trial of a bishop, the result must be absolutely fatal to the Ritualists. A favorable judgment would only hand them over to the temporal power, which would say, "*We* have at least as good a jurisdiction as *you* have, for you could have none from the founders of your communion; you have only the

jurisdiction which Queen Elizabeth bequeathed to you, while we have our jurisdiction from Queen Victoria." Or, if the judgment of Convocation should be unfavorable, all that would happen would be, in the words of Lord Halifax, that Convocation "would rule the sacramental principle out of the Church," and the only result would be—with the great body of the Ritualists—that they would compassionate "poor benighted Convocation," and look forward to "more Catholic" houses by and by.

This is about the pith of the whole matter. Earnest Ritualists will certainly now leave the ship, which, in addition to having no rudder and no captain, has all its sails set for different points of the wind; while such is the wholesale mutiny or disaffection that even a skipper, or a cook, or a cabin-boy can "prosecute" a chief officer of the ship, and the nominal captain has to admit, "I am no captain; you must refer the matter to the shipowners in the city of London." This is the Church! And not only the Church, but the Catholic Church. This is the "Second Incarnation." This is the institution which Christ died to found, and with which He promised to be to the end of time. No, the poor Church of England is in its dotage. It has lived nearly three centuries, and having tried every possible shift of doctrine and of ritual, having right-about-faced a thousand times, having never known what it did believe or ought to teach, while always protesting against the Church from which it revolted, it has at last taken up with this final attitude in which it would be but decorous that it should expire: "As the Catholic religion is true, and as we cannot find out what the Catholic religion is, it follows that the Catholic religion is unknowable."

JANSENISTS, OLD CATHOLICS, AND THEIR FRIENDS IN AMERICA.

Catéchisme Catholique. Publié par le Rév. Père René Vilatte, et approuvé par Mgr. J. H. Hobart Brown, Evêque Catholique. 1886.

Livre de Prières Liturgiques, à l'usage des Vieux Catholiques. New York : Imprimerie James Pott et Cie., 14 et 16 Astor Place.

THE Jansenist Church at Utrecht, in Holland, with its pretended archbishop, suffragans, and a handful of adherents, after dragging on a feeble existence for nearly two centuries, was brought into prominence by the countenance and support which the imperial government of Germany gave the little body of professors and priests who refused to acknowledge the decrees of the Vatican Council. They assumed the title of Old Catholics, which was odd enough for new heretics. Like the bodies who broke away from the Scriptures and the Church in the 16th century, these people, having no bishops, had no means of perpetuating the ministry; and, while professing to believe in seven Sacraments, and of course in Holy Orders, found themselves in the peculiar position of a Church believing in the Apostolic Succession, in the Episcopate, and in ordination by the bishop's hands, but without a bishop. They were, indeed, acephaloi, an Episcopal Church without an Episcopate.

They proceeded to elect bishops, and the question was, where these men were to obtain episcopal consecration. Protestant attempts to obtain consecration at the hands of bishops in oriental churches did not inspire much hope of success in that quarter. To ask it of the Anglican bishops was to avow themselves Protestants, when they denied that they really were so. They then turned to the little schismatic church in Holland, founded in 1723 by seven Jansenist priests, who, assuming to be the chapter of the Cathedral of Utrecht, a see swept away at the time of the so-called Reformation and never restored, proceeded to elect one Steenhoven archbishop of that dormant bishopric. To obtain episcopal consecration, Van Steenhoven applied to one who had been a missionary in Illinois, Dominic Mary Varlet, who, after ministering at Cahokia, became Vicar-General of Quebec for the Mississippi Valley, and stood so high that he was appointed and consecrated Bishop of Ascalon and coadjutor to the Bishop of Babylon. While on his way to the east, having become, by the death of its incumbent, bishop of the latter see, he was summoned to Rome, where it had been ascertained, somewhat too late, that he was an avowed Jan-

senist, and actively working with the leaders of that sect. Instead of obeying the order of the Sovereign Pontiff, he retired to Holland, and there committed the crime of sacrilegiously consecrating as Archbishop of Utrecht a priest chosen by a self-constituted body, without any bulls of the Pope or confirmation of the election. As death removed the pretended Archbishop of Utrecht, the wretched Varlet consecrated others. To keep up a succession, one of the pseudo-archbishops established sees at Haarlem and Deventer, and consecrated bishops for them. This was the utterly irregular, schismatical, and sacrilegious source to which Reinkens, chosen bishop by the Old Catholic party, applied for consecration.

Some Protestant-Episcopal writers in this country lay great stress on the necessity of consecration by three bishops. According to their theory, even, Van Steenhoven's consecration was irregular and void, and the consecration of the first suffragan bishop was no less irregular.

This schismatic Church of Utrecht owed its origin to one who had been a missionary in America. Towards the close of the second decade of this century an attempt was made to create a schism in the Catholic Church in this country, and have a bishop consecrated for Norfolk, Virginia, by the pseudo-Archbishop of Utrecht. In New York, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Charleston, and elsewhere, congregations, or rather trustees pretending to represent congregations, men often utterly ignorant of Catholic doctrine and discipline, and strangers to all practices of religion which the Church requires from her members, claimed the right of appointing priests in the churches where state law authorized them to manage the temporal property of the congregation. The bishops resisted this attempt to introduce a feature of Congregationalism into the Catholic Church. A Dominican stationed at New York, one Father Carbry, was a busy fomentor of these disturbances at Norfolk and Charleston, where troubles lasted for years. They had defeated all efforts of Archbishops Carroll and Neale for the good of religion by upholding unworthy priests against them, and driving away clergymen who were really doing good and reviving religion in the hearts of the people. When the malcontents found that Archbishop Maréchal was even less disposed than his predecessors to yield to the demands of schism and irreligion, Carbry advised them to apply to the pseudo-Archbishop of Utrecht. There was at the time an Irish priest, Rev. Father Hayes, O.S.F., who, as agent of the Irish bishops at Rome, had so hotly opposed the plan of giving the English government a veto on the appointments of Catholic bishops in Great Britain and Ireland, that he was ordered by the Papal authorities to leave the Pontifical states. Carbry supposed that he had a pliant tool in this priest, but if Mr.

Hayes had been intemperate in language, carried away by his zeal for the safety of the Church in Ireland, he was no hypocrite and no traitor. When he received from Carbry a letter urging him to go to Utrecht and be consecrated Bishop of Norfolk, Rev. Mr. Hayes at once laid the letter before the authorities at Rome. That ended the first attempt to plant here a branch of that wretched little schism which never has had five thousand adherents, one of the pseudo-bishops, who claims the See of Deventer, not having a priest or adherent in his imaginary diocese.

It will scarcely be credited that an attempt has been recently made in this country to introduce the progeny of this Holland schism, the moribund Old Catholic schism, among Catholics in this country, and that the scheme originated with, and has been managed, by the once respectable Protestant Episcopal Church, with an amount of duplicity that has nothing to equal it in the whole religious history of America. The Catholic Church has had violence shown it in deed and word. Churches, convents, and institutions have been destroyed. Libels of the grossest immorality have been sent broadcast to embitter the ignorant against her. But for a Protestant body to sneak in among Catholics and impose on them by sending men to teach a corrupted Catholic doctrine and pretend to be Catholic priests, has never had a precedent. This system of hypocrisy and double dealing certainly cannot appeal to the sense of honor, truth, and decency in any man. It is a case that admits of no excuse and no palliation.

One René Vilatte, who had been for some time in Canada, went to the Western States, where he entered a house of the Alexian Brothers, and subsequently became cook among the brothers of St. Viateur, at Bourbonnais, Kankakee County, Illinois. Here he seems to have fallen in with Chiniquy, and resolved to work under him. In 1884 he went to Green Bay, and began to preach in the French Presbyterian Church, and to distribute Chiniquy's tracts among the French Catholics. He did not succeed, however, to any extent, and in August obtained ordination as a Presbyterian minister. He soon made an addition to his chapel, and in October invited Chiniquy to come and dedicate it. He was ere long lecturing against the Catholic Church at Green Bay, Fort Howard, Marinette, and other points in Wisconsin. This seemed to close his career as a Presbyterian, for early in 1885 it was announced that this gentleman had seen the error of Presbyterianism, and had been received into the Protestant-Episcopal Church by Bishop Brown, of Fond-du-Lac, who was soon reported to have ordained him deacon. But whether this was really so or not, Bishop Brown did not give him priest's orders in the Episcopal Church. He had no use for him as an Episcopal minister, having no French Episcopalians for such a

clergyman to minister unto. The field where Bishop Brown proposed that Vilatte should work, and where the ex-Presbyterian minister proposed to work, was among the French-speaking Belgians who had settled on the peninsula between Green Bay and Lake Michigan. Vilatte had learned by experience that a Protestant minister, as such, could not effect much among these people. It seemed to him and Bishop Brown that if he could go in the guise of a Catholic priest, he might meet with some success. It was therefore devised that he should go to Europe and obtain ordination from Herzog, Old Catholic pseudo-bishop in Switzerland.

To tell his real antecedents, his recent conversion from Presbyterianism, would not do; hence pretty little romances like the following found their way to papers in the east and west, and the man who had been a Presbyterian in 1884, was represented as having been a Seminarian in a Catholic theological seminary in 1885, when in fact he had never been one at all.

"It was in 1885 that a young man who had been educated as a Seminarian at Paris came to America to complete his studies for the Roman priesthood. After he had finished these studies, and when within a few months of his ordination, he reached the conclusion, though not breaking with the Roman authorities, not to enter the Roman priesthood. His sister was the mother superior of a convent in Paris, and all his fortunes were in the line of the Roman communion, but his convictions more and more led him into dissent from the doctrine of papal infallibility, and without the slightest rupture with the Roman bishop, under whom he was preparing for holy orders, he quietly withdrew. It was some little time before he found his bearings. He had already seen a field white for the harvest among the French-speaking Belgians, and his convictions as a Catholic led him to think of establishing modified Roman Catholic services among them. In his perplexity he wrote to Père Hyacinthe in Paris, who suggested that he should come to Europe to receive his ordination at the hands of Bishop Herzog of the Old Catholic Church, and should then return to America and place his services at the command of the Anglican bishop of the west, in whose diocese lay the communities where he thought that there was a field for his efforts. Bishop Brown was not more surprised than delighted to find that this young priest had come to him at the very time when he was in the greatest quandary as to the best methods, if any were possible, for reaching a people who were slipping away from Christianity, and for whose instruction no provision could be made. Young Père Vilatte offered to go among these Belgian farmers and see what he could do."

Certain it is that Vilatte returned, having been ordained by Bishop Herzog in June, 1885, on the recommendation of Bishop

Brown, styling himself Catholic Bishop of Fond-du-Lac, but was received by Bishop Brown and sent as an Episcopal minister under Catholic colors to seduce Belgian Catholics from the Church, and of course, in time, make them Episcopalians. A pamphlet published in connection with Vilatte's mission admits this fraud and dishonesty. It says: "This course was decided upon on account of the religious prejudices on the part of the Belgians for whose religious wants Bishop Brown had selected him. If he had gone as an American priest among them, he would have been ignored as a Protestant minister. Anglican orders, particularly when derived from an episcopate officially styled 'Protestant,' are in disrepute with all Roman Catholics; the very name of Protestant is hateful and makes them shrink back; in short, they will have nothing to do with anything connected with Protestantism. On the other hand, Old Catholic orders, like the Greek, are held to be valid by them. The Bishop of Fond-du-Lac had the sagacity to see this and decide accordingly."

It is a pity the bishop was not guided by his sense of truth and honesty, rather than by his sagacity. Bishop Brown in his own name wrote in July, 1885: "In this diocese English-speaking people are in the minority. We have masses of Germans, Belgians, Hollanders, Welsh, Danes, Swedes, Poles, Norwegians. In some districts English is hardly known. This state of affairs is very trying to the diocese, as missions and parishes succumb to the foreigner and new work is difficult. I have long felt that the Church ought to meet the stranger and be his guide and friend, and that then his children would become hers. Near Green Bay are thirty thousand Belgians, French-speaking of course. Many of these, I am told,—six or eight thousand,—are somewhat affected by the *Alt Katholik* movement. An unusually intelligent and sagacious young Frenchman offered himself to me as a missionary to these people. His acquirements being sufficient and the urgency great, I determined to send the young gentleman to Bishop Herzog. The object was two-fold. First, to save discussion as to authority. We had reason to think that all *Alt Katholik* ministrations would be welcomed. Ours would be questioned. Next, we wished to win the immigrants of mature age, men and women with religious habits formed and with prejudices fixed and not likely to ever learn the English language. . . . If we get *them*, the next generation will be with *us* thoroughly."

Vilatte, after an essay of his powers at Green Bay, went to Little Sturgeon, and opened a church under the title of the Precious Blood, and here Bishop Brown soon came to lay the corner-stone of a seminary, for French something, whether Episcopal ministers avowed, or Old Catholic priests ostensibly, it is not easy to say.

Appeals were made in the east and means obtained to carry on the work. Then a Catechism and Prayer-Book were printed for the use of the new church. The Catechism bears the express approbation of Dr. Brown, who again styles himself Catholic Bishop. "Catechisme Catholique. Publié par le Rév. Père René Vilatte, et approuvé par Mgr. J. H. Hobart Brown, Evêque Catholique." Then a Cross with rays; a text from St. Matthew xxiv., 30, and the date 1886.

The prayer-book printed for his mission was one compiled by M. B. Vimeux, of Geneva, and approved by Herzog. The title is less deceptive than that of the Catechism: "Livre de Prières Liturgiques, à l'usage des Vieux Catholiques." It does not, indeed, bear the name of Bishop Brown as the Catechism does, but was issued from a well-known Episcopal publishing house in New York, and was undoubtedly used with his full sanction.

Now let us see into what strange inconsistency and double dealing the desire to seduce Roman Catholics from their Church led this bishop. The Articles of Religion in his Book of Common Prayer used in his English-speaking churches declare that the Nicene creed ought to be received.

The Little Sturgeon French prayer-book mutilates the creed and virtually denies the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son.

In the English prayer-book (Art. xx.) images and invocation of saints are condemned as repugnant to the Word of God, but in the French Catechism, approved by the Bishop of Fond-du-Lac, is the question: "Does this Commandment (second) forbid honoring the Blessed Virgin and the Saints"? "No, for honoring the Blessed Virgin and the Saints is not adoring them or making idols of them."

In the English-speaking churches of his denomination the people were taught (Art. xxv.): "Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel"; but at Little Sturgeon he authorized this teaching: "How many Sacraments are there"? "There are seven Sacraments: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony."

The Episcopalians in that part of Wisconsin were taught in their Book of Common Prayer that the "Sacrifice of Masses were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits" (Art. xxxi.); and yet, in the Catechism approved by a bishop habitually using the Book of Common Prayer, is a chapter devoted to the Mass, in which, contradicting the English prayer-book, it says: "The Mass is not only a memorial of the Last Supper, for in the Mass Jesus Christ

really exists under the forms of bread and wine after the consecration."

The French prayer-book opens with "Rubrics of Mass," contains "The Ordinary of the Mass" with prayers "In Masses for the Dead," Introits, Collects, etc., for the Sundays of the year, and for "Feasts of Mary," for Festivals of Saints, for All Souls, and a Mass for the Burial of the Dead.

The Catechism, though it rejects the authority of the Pope and exalts that of the Ecumenical Councils, advocates the marriage of the clergy and Mass in the vernacular, retains more of Catholic faith and discipline than the prayer-book of Vimeux, and shows more clearly the design of deceiving and entrapping the unwary; while once within the toils, a congregation could be easily led to substitute the French Book of Common Prayer, in use in the French Episcopal Church in New York, for Vimeux's, and the Catechism would disappear. These books were but scaffolding to aid in erecting the building, and destined to be pulled down, with very little regard, when the edifice was completed.

But how could an honest man in the position of a bishop of the Protestant-Episcopal Church authorize or encourage such contradictory teaching; profess the procession from the Father and the Son in his diocese generally, and yet impugn it in certain places; condemn the veneration of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints as anti-Scriptural, and yet commend and justify it; declare that there are only two Sacraments and declare that there are seven; deny and admit that Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction are Sacraments, and yet teach that they are really Sacraments; denounce the Mass as "a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit," and yet uphold it in Catechism and prayer-book? Is there an example anywhere in this country of any denomination putting forward, at once, such contradictory doctrines? It cannot be pleaded that the Thirty-nine Articles had grown obsolete, like the Augsburg Confession in a Lutheran prayer-book, and that it was retained merely as a monument of bygone days; for no one will pretend that the Episcopalians of the diocese of Fond-du-Lac profess to honor the Blessed Virgin and the Saints by invoking them or keeping their images; or believe in Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction as Sacraments; or hear Mass as the great act of public worship of the new law in which Christ is really present after consecration.

These are not points held by the Episcopalians of Fond-du-Lac diocese, and to send a minister to teach them, and to approve the teaching, while holding contrary doctrine, or really holding these doctrines, and habitually denounce them, is a strange position for any man of uprightness and honesty. Are we to infer that it is

claimed that in the attempt to diminish the number of Catholics, any falsehood, calumny, trick, or fraud is permissible, or what is more, to be encouraged and believed?

It is certainly to give unbelievers who scoff at Christianity some pretext for their conduct, when they can appeal to such double dealing in defiance of all moral honesty, as being practised and defended by professing Christians.

The diocese of Green Bay has always been one where the Catholic bishops have had great difficulties to encounter in the general poverty and scattered condition of the faithful, as well as in the multitude of languages spoken. The bishop has to find priests able to give instructions and hear confessions in English, French, German, Holland Dutch, Walloon, Bohemian, Polish, and Menominee. In a small congregation of a hundred families a priest may find three languages necessary for the exercise of the ministry. It was not easy to obtain priests able to take charge of these missions, or to prevent their becoming discouraged when they found even the scanty allowance expected by a priest almost impossible. Hence, there were occasional vacancies, but the charge that the late Bishop Krautbauer, or his successor, Bishop Katzer, has neglected the Belgian Catholics on the peninsula, is utterly unfounded. The Very Rev. Mr. Daems, himself a Belgian, more than thirty years ago, began establishing churches and schools among them. The Sisters of the Holy Cross were the pioneer religious teachers; but Bishop Krautbauer soon felt that the district was one that could be properly attended only by a religious community, and during his administration made constant efforts to find an order that would assume the care of that part of his diocese, and from a central point attend the scattered missions; while he found that stationing priests, as he did at the principal places, all could not be attended frequently enough to maintain faith and devotion among the people. Bishop Katzer, entertaining the same conviction, also sought a community for this mission ground, and succeeded in obtaining a colony of the Priests of Mercy. Priests of this order are now laboring at Green Bay, Bay Settlement, and Rosière, and attend stations at Brussels, Delwiche, Dykesville, Grandlez, Little Sturgeon, Marchand, Martinsville, Robinson, Thiry Daems, Walhain, aided by Franciscan Sisters, who have charge of schools.

Men like Vilatte are not uncommon; "weeds from the Pope's garden" have been and will be taken up among Protestants, who, by encouraging them, hope to do God service. This we know and expect, as a matter of course, and can only deplore the blind credulity which lavishes money on such unworthy men. The injury done to the Catholic Church in this country by such men has

never been comparatively great after they left her bosom ; the mischief was wrought chiefly while they remained, discharging a ministry of which they were unworthy.

Vilatte's case is peculiar from the double dealing which he led an Episcopal bishop to practise, and from the curious spectacle of the head of one denomination endeavoring to set up another inconsistent with his own. Vilatte will effect less injury to Catholic souls in Wisconsin than to Protestant pockets in the Eastern States. What will become of him and his projects when the Episcopal Church withdraws, as it must in all decency withdraw, its countenance, and zealous Episcopalians their financial support, cannot be decided. He may return to the Presbyterian fold or try some other Protestant denomination, or may set up as a bishop or lapse into obscurity. In himself he is nothing ; for amid a district inhabited by seven thousand Catholics, with all the means placed at his disposal by generous but deluded people, he never succeeded in getting more than twenty families.

The only peculiarity in his case is the fact that he has been able to draw a respectable Protestant denomination into plans and methods hitherto unheard of, and which outspoken ministers in that very body do not hesitate to condemn and denounce with all the energy of upright honesty.

THE FORTHCOMING CATHOLIC CONGRESS.

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINE will be memorable for centennial commemorations. The centenary of Bishop Carroll's appointment as Bishop of Baltimore occurs also this year, and will be celebrated with all the ceremonial pomp that his successor, Cardinal Gibbons, assisted by the great body of the hierarchy, can employ to honor the memory of the first Catholic bishop, and, we may add, one of the most patriotic of the original citizens of the United States. The *fête* will begin on the 10th of November in the cathedral of Baltimore, and will be terminated in Washington the following Wednesday, when the new Catholic University will be inaugurated. The anniversary will be further signalized by the meeting of the first Congress of the Catholic laymen of the United States. The Congress will meet also in Baltimore, Monday the 11th of November, and adjourn in the evening of Tuesday, so as to permit the members to attend the inaugural ceremonies in Washington the next day.

The idea of the Congress, and of holding it contemporaneously with the Carroll commemoration, was the happy conception of Major Henry F. Brownson, of Detroit, on whom, also, most of the preparatory work has fallen. The three events will make the date a highly conspicuous one in the annals of the Church, and will certainly introduce a new epoch of religious and intellectual progress in this country. On this occasion, the *QUARTERLY* is obliged to refrain from discussing the larger theme, and to confine its remarks to the Congress. That the deliberations and utterances of such a body should be fruitful of good results is the unanimous opinion of all the ecclesiastical authorities who have been consulted. No discord or unpleasant controversy can arise among intelligent, disinterested men, who have the same ends in view, and contemplate no other means for reaching them than peaceful action and the diffusion of Catholic ideas. At the end of the first century of our government, and of the normal organization of our Church, and the cloudless, rosy dawn of the second century, the prudence of looking before and after is obvious. There are lessons in the past which may be made to illuminate the yet untrodden paths before us. Apart from that, it is highly desirable to bring all our Catholic fellow-citizens, scattered as they necessarily are over an immense area, into organic relation with one another. We are of different origins, of various nationalities, and have hardly as yet a common tongue. In a certain striking way, we are a type of the universal Church—of the Church that was commanded to teach all nations;

which holds that all men are of one blood, and which enfolds and continues to gather into its fold men of all races, nationalities and tongues.

The movement for a lay Congress was formally begun in Chicago last May by a meeting of distinguished Catholic laymen, presided over by Archbishop Ireland, of Minnesota. His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, and several other active and zealous prelates, had been consulted by the author of the project, and others by Mr. W. J. Onahan, of Chicago. The ecclesiastical rulers, whose counsel was solicited, all declared in its favor, and this gave ample guarantee of its success; because, no doubt, they expressed the opinion of the whole hierarchy. So fortified, the Chicago committee decided to call a preliminary conference of Catholics, lay and clerical, in Detroit for the 5th of June, to mature the plan of organization, mark out the limits of the work contemplated, and formulate and issue the call for the Congress. The conference met on the day appointed in the Catholic Club house in Detroit, and held sessions for two days. There were present representatives of the laity, clergy and prelacy, though the laymen largely predominated. The German, the Irish, and the native-born Catholics were represented respectively by Germans, Irishmen and Americans. The negro race was represented by one of themselves, a man of marked intelligence and zeal, and the Indians by an eloquent missionary priest of the De Smet order. Bishop Marty, of Dakota, was chairman, and Bishop Foley, of Detroit, took a prominent part in the discussions. The outlines of the programme sketched at the Chicago meeting, slightly modified, were approved, and the call for the Congress was ordered to be issued.

The plan of organization and programme of proceedings are broad and simple. Every Catholic, lay and clerical, has the right to sit in the Congress and participate in the discussions, but the President and all the other officers will be laymen. Papers on the following subjects will be written and read by laymen, but will be subject to discussion by the meeting.

“Lay Action in the Church Charities.”

“Education.”

“Societies.”

“Immigration and Colonization.”

“Progress of the Church during the Century.”

In addition, there will be also, we are informed, some formal expression of sympathy with the Holy Father in his present painful and precarious situation, and a protest against the anomalous conditions imposed on the Apostolic See by the Italian government. Manifestly none of these subjects can be exhaustively treated at the forthcoming meeting, and it is equally evident that but a little

time can be allotted to the discussion of each paper. From the circumstances of the case, these essays must be few and the speeches brief, or the Congress could never be able to fulfil its mission in the two days of its duration. Following the precedent set by similar associations in Europe and America, no vote will be taken on any proposition. It would be unwise to attempt very much at this, the first, Congress. After all, its prime function will be to lay the foundations of a permanent institution like the Congress of the United States itself, which shall meet biennially, or if not, at other stated periods, and be the authoritative and supreme organ of the Catholic laity of the United States.

The actual position of the Holy Father and the Papacy itself are objects of profound solicitude throughout the Catholic world, and not less here in the United States than in other countries, near and far. The opinion of American Catholics should, it seems to us, have at least as much *moral* weight and be listened to with as much attention as the opinion of any equal number of our brethren in the Old World. All the governments on this continent are republican in form and wholly secular. Brazil and Canada are in fact no exceptions, though the head of each the likeness of a kingly crown has on. But, however this may be, no one will deny that our own government is the freest on earth. It is of all governments the most radically secularized, the most thoroughly republican. The great majority of its citizens, its legislators, its rulers, its officials, high and low, in every department, civil and military, are Protestants; and yet it has no more loyal and devoted adherents than its Catholic citizens—none more opposed to any change in its institutions, or to any reactionary policies. Fidelity to the government is an essential part of Catholic teaching, a solemn obligation on the Catholic conscience. Catholic loyalty is rooted in the conscience, and hence the Catholic community is always a tower of strength to every just government, of whatever form, which respects the rights of conscience—failing which, it could not of course be just. Composed as we are of Americans, Germans, Irishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Bohemians, Poles, Italians, Negroes, Indians, we may, without straining the similitude, be considered a microcosm of the Church at large, which in its constitution, spirit, practice, and official *personnel*, transcends and morally obliterates the narrow limitations of nationality and race.

The voice of such a diverse democratic multitude, sympathizing with the Vicar of Christ in his imprisonment, would sound like a sphoral symphony in his ears, and strike elsewhere with the sound of the tempest. In common with all other American citizens, we Catholics have a profound antipathy to any union of the spiritual and temporal power in an individual or a legislature—to

any union of Church and State, but the extent of the power demanded by the Holy Father is simply the power to act freely within the Church, to be master of his own household, so that he may exercise his august office without let or hindrance, whether from Crispi's myrmidons or the emissaries of the secret societies, who abound in Italy, and especially in the city of Rome, and who at bottom are as much the enemies of the Quirinal itself as of the Vatican, for they are all revolutionists and communists. Elevated above mere earthly ambition, the successor of St. Peter (worthy to rank with the greatest of that illustrious line, which counts greater names and a greater number of them than all other dynasties together) stands alone, the representative of the Divine Government, the far-resounding voice of the HIGHER LAW, the Apostle of Peace in the midst of the ominous armed powers that threaten in the near future the well-being of all civilized society and the existence of many nations. From his lofty watch-tower he sees the horizon all around black with the thunder-cloud, and glimmering with steel, and the kings moving stealthily in the lists with lowering looks and hand on hilt, impatient for the fray. Who but HE can oppose those royal and imperial anarchs? He asks for no serried hosts, bristling with bayonets, no far-spreading territory, but simply for that one spot of earth which from time immemorial has belonged to the Papacy and which the experience of centuries has demonstrated to be indispensable for the free, efficient exercise of its spiritual functions, not the least of which are the promotion of peace and good-will among the nations. To say this in firm and moderate language can give no offence in any quarter, and, indeed, we might take shame to ourselves if we suffered the great occasion to pass without enunciating some such sentiment. When the Catholics of every country in Europe, and of several states on this continent, have spoken out boldly on the Roman question, we cannot afford to remain dumb, or speak with bated breath and whispering humbleness. We are not only the peers of all the ages, but of all the races; and as citizens of the United States stand as the foremost files of time, and consequently our attitude on this question will attract universal notice, and give the tone to Catholic sentiment on this continent. Our utterances should be commensurate with our position. We should be equal to the occasion, and have the courage to strike a lofty note in the general chorus. Our proper place is in the foremost ranks of the Catholic movement. The new crusade in behalf of our spiritual sovereign is a civil and moral, not a military one. Peace is the sign on its forehead and the word in its mouth.

Historic Italy is a cherished memory with every enlightened Catholic, a vital thought in every mind, nor is there any sentiment

of hostility or malevolence towards that famous country in the bosom of any class or constituent of the great American people. We would gladly see modern Italy rival the exploits of the republic of ancient Rome and the achievements in arts and letters of the mediæval republics, but unfortunately her ambition seems to be modelled on that of imperial Rome. The baleful spell of militarism, the curse of contemporary Europe, has touched her inmost soul, and we see the flower of her youth waste the best years of life in the training camps and casernes. The time was when reformers and philanthropists shed torrents of crocodile tears over the unhappy condition of Italy, where men and women dwelt for life within convent walls. Although in general the inmates led useful and innocent lives, and contributed their full share to the ample page of knowledge,—to literature, philosophy and science,—to the fine, the useful and the ornamental arts,—yet the orders and communities of both sexes and the whole monastic system were inexhaustible themes of defamation and denunciation. Throughout Italy, to-day, there are at least a hundred men in the old monasteries (they have been turned into barracks) for the one that dwelt there before. Has Italy gained or lost by substituting a hundred idle soldiers (the soldier is better idle than active) for the one peaceful monk, who worked as well as prayed? Her people are poorer than ever, for taxation is heavier than ever. Her national debt threatens national bankruptcy, and her municipalities are terribly overloaded. Emigration from her ports increases from day to day, and this is the surest evidence of poverty and privation. The radii of the exodus strike many lands—especially France, South America and our own country. Unfortunately for the welfare of her people, she is a member of an alliance that exacts from her military and naval expenditures far beyond her resources. This alliance can put two millions of men in the field on short notice, and has twice as many organized as a rear guard and capable of mobilization. The legions of France and Russia are quite as ready and quite as many. In continental Europe there are, to-day, twelve millions of soldiers who will sleep to-night with their heads upon their swords, as it were, knowing that the tocsin may sound any moment. This is the condition of Europe one hundred years after the French Revolution and its sun-burst of glorious promise, and three hundred and seventy years after the rise of its progenitor, the "REFORMATION," when the new gospel light dawned from Anna Boleyn's eyes! And what oceans of blood have been shed in the meantime! The growth of civilization, forsooth! The idols of the modern peoples seem to be great armies, great empires, immense magnitude—irresistible force. Yet nothing is truer than that great armies and great empires are disastrous to public and

private well-being, industrial progress and intellectual culture. Bigness is not identical with greatness, nor military glory with social happiness, or the pursuit of the true, the beautiful and sublime. Athens was a small republic, Judea a small kingdom. Neither Venice, Florence, Genoa, nor any other Italian republic could boast of extended territory. Aragon and Castile were small states. Yet they all produced great men, and these are the supreme product—the finest flower and fruit of humanity, and the ultimate measure and criterion of worth, when the capabilities of institutions and nationalities are tested. We avail ourselves of the occasion to remark that the doctrine of nationality, which has played so important a part in the political sphere for the last half century, is in its essence reactionary and disintegrating. In the last analysis it means nothing but tribal egotism. What is the good of Welsh nationality, for instance, with its Welsh-speaking press and pulpit, its annual Eisteddfods, with their white-bearded, thin-voiced bards repeating grotesque Arthurian legends in that uncouth dialect of superfluous consonants. High-born Hoel's harp or soft Llewellyn's lay, or any other lay worth the singing, will be heard no more forever in that dialect. The bardic tournaments are as important as were Owen Glendower's incantations.

The effect of it all is to keep the Welsh people isolated and intellectually stagnant in the fastnesses of their mountains, while the great world, unseen, unheard, spins forever down the ringing grooves of change. It is true, there may be magic in it when the invader comes; and to the end of time the song and story which tell of the heroic deeds of their ancestors will be the most highly prized ballad-literature of every people; but that is all.

What do we see when we turn to the greatest empire, the greatest nationality in the world, judging it by the size of its territory, the number of its population, and its longevity as a state? The Chinese, in their own estimation, are infinitely superior to all others. They are celestials, while all the rest of us are terrestrials. They cherish the deepest contempt for the outside world of barbarians, especially for Europeans and Americans, whom they politely call foreign devils. By their exclusiveness, they have walled themselves in from all free and healthy contact with civilized life and the Christian nations. They are utterly debased, superstitious, cruel, and poverty-stricken. In its immobility, China is a monument of the petrifying power of nationality, and of the impotence of the principle by itself to exalt or advance a community, morally or intellectually, or even to secure the material well-being of the commonalty.

Only at our peril can we refuse to take note of the lesson which is writ large and many times on the historic page. The nations

and tribes who were forced to submit to the Roman yoke gained much more than they lost. They received the language, laws, and institutions of Rome in exchange for their barbaric independence and national customs. On the ruins of the rude tribal polity and traditions rose the fair edifice of Roman civilization. The Etruscan, the Ligurian, the Gaul, the Briton, the Iberian, the Numidian, the Goth, became Roman, each to his own great benefit. It is remarkable that the countries trodden by the legions, the places where the eagles dwelt, on the Rhine, the Danube, the Seine, the Thames, and elsewhere, are still the brightest spots on the map of Europe.

In old composite states like Austria, for instance, the principle of nationality is acting as a solvent, and threatening them with disintegration. It has served, and will continue to serve, as a cloak for territorial rapacity and military adventure. Under its sanction Denmark has been despoiled of Schleswig-Holstein and France of Alsace-Lorraine. Napoleon the Third invoked the principle—to his own ultimate ruin, he it remarked—when he invaded Lombardy. But as soon as the Austrians were driven into the famous quadrilateral of those days, he coolly turned round and despoiled Italy of Nice. Savoy is French, not Italian, and, properly speaking, was *un pièce rapportée*. Pan-slavism, which is the Russian name for Russian nationality, threatens to swallow up the Balkan states and all southern Europe east of the Adriatic. When the purpose is to enlarge the frontiers, to seize foreign territory, modern state-craft talks loudly of the sacred claims of race and kindred; when the purpose is to hold weaker nationalities in subjection, the principle is cynically ignored. The czar shows no disposition to restore the German provinces on the Baltic to the German empire, or to grant self-government to Poland. Prussia and Austria are equally deaf to the prayers of their Polish subjects. Between Germany, on the one hand, and France, on the other, Holland and Belgium are in a perilous situation, and will hardly survive the next general war. Undoubtedly, the doctrine of nationality has been overrated by publicists as well as poets. Fortunately it has no place in the Constitution, the laws, or the government of the United States. It is also unknown in Switzerland, which is a confederation of Germans, Gauls, Italians, and other less conspicuous denominations. America is free and happy; Switzerland suffers somewhat from the tyranny of fanatical majorities here and there in some of the cantons, but, on the whole, is tranquil and prosperous. The reintegration of Italy has been productive of no material good to the Italians. Nor have they produced a statesman since Cavour, nor have the reigns of Victor Emmanuel and Umberto been accompanied by any literary or artistic renaissance. The

Italian kingdom is undoubtedly a great fact, and, some good folk hope, an enduring one, but the Papacy is also a great fact, and an eternal one. As long as the local secular power overrides, or bullies, or menaces the universal spiritual power, there will be heart-burnings and discontent, and sullen murmurings will be heard far and near, and, in short, a feeling of insecurity and apprehension be widely prevalent. Rome itself, in any sense but the geographical one, belongs much more to Christendom at large than to Italy. To have made it merely the capital of the kingdom was to belittle it—to dim its prestige and ignore its history. There is not a monument or work of art within its mouldering walls; not a fountain, a hospital, or church; not an institution of learning or charity, numerous though they be, that is not indebted to the Popes for its creation or preservation, and indirectly to the Catholics of all ages and nations. Rome is built, stone by stone, of the *oboli* of past generations of Catholics the world over. It is not a national, but an international, centre—the once metropolitan and cosmopolitan city of the globe. May Italy prosper! Let her outshine her former self in great deeds and great works of genius, but above all, and before all, let the VICAR of CHRIST be free! At present he is not free, or even safe. He is perpetually insulted, as he was on Whit-sunday last, when the statue of Bruno, the apostate, was publicly unveiled in the presence of a blasphemous rabble shouting for Barabbas. When no man wearing the ecclesiastical garb is exempt from threats and affronts on the streets; when the funeral procession of a deceased Pontiff can proceed on its way only at night, and not then unless guarded by an encircling fringe of bayonets; when dynamite bombs are flung at the pulpits in thronged churches during the Lenten season, it is mockery to talk of a free Church in a free State, or that His Holiness is not held in duress and encompassed by bitter enemies.

How can the modern Italian forget that the Papacy has been the heart and shield, the rock and strong tower of Italy from the day the seat of empire was transferred to Constantinople? Were it not for the Popes there would be no Italy, and the inhabitants to-day would probably be speaking a German or Mongolian dialect. It was the Popes that saved her from Goth, Ostrogoth, and Vandal; from the petrific mace of Byzantine absolutism; from the Hun, the Saracen, and the Turk. Italian nationality survived because it found refuge from every storm in the bark of Peter. And it may find a needed asylum there again when all else fails. The Frank knows the road across the Alps, and by the Ligurian shore; the Hohenzollern may tread in the footsteps of the Hohenstaufen and the Hapsburg; the mighty Czar, who rules a hundred and twenty millions, may, in the course of events, penetrate further

south than Attila, and pitch his tent on the Tiber, or even beneath the shadow of Vesuvius. Judging from her authentic history,—from the days of Brennus and Hannibal to the days of the emperors Francis Joseph and Napoleon III.,—Italy is more subject to invasion than any other country in Europe. It is not at all impossible that the divinity which doth hedge the Vicar of Christ may fall around her as a shining ægis, and be her salvation in the coming time, as it has been in the past.

But vistas of this kind lie far away from our field of vision as Americans. The American invaders of Italy will not be soldiers, but peaceful pilgrims, who will continue to flock thither to visit her shrines of religion and art, and ask the blessing of the Holy Father. In pleading for the independence of the Holy See we would appeal to moral force, not to brute force—to universal public opinion, not to the sword. Dearly prized as the object is, we would employ no means to accomplish it but peaceful means. We would pursue no policy but the wise and noble policy of the great O'Connell. The statesmanship, traditions, and feelings of the American people are utterly opposed to the intervention of our government in the domestic affairs of other countries; and American Catholics are heart and soul in favor of maintaining that wise and salutary principle; but, in common with all our fellow-citizens, we are called upon, from time to time, to exercise the right of expressing ourselves on important international, as well as domestic, questions; of declaring for the right and against the wrong, abroad as well as at home, and in that way of contributing to the advancement of liberal and humane principles, and to the prolongation, if we cannot say the perpetuation, of the TRUCE OF GOD—a measure more urgently called for now, when the front of battle seems to lower, than when the CHURCH first instituted it to bridle the ferocity of feudal warfare.

Among the papers, the historic sketch of the progress of the Church from the days of Carroll to the present time will probably be the most interesting, if not the most important. Bigotry and sectarian animosities were rife during Colonial times, and fear and hatred of the Catholic Church especially. These passions descended to the Republic, and are not quite extinct yet. Nevertheless, the CHURCH has advanced, and continues to advance, by leaps and bounds. One of the chief causes of the phenomenon is the heroic spirit with which she has met trials and dangers. The lineage of her martyrs is unbroken. Every event, every calamity that called for the offices of charity to ameliorate the misery of the afflicted has been heard by willing ears within her fold. Every national crisis, from first to last, has tested and proved the worth and valor of the Catholic body. The revolutionary war crowned the Catholics with honor, and partially burned out Protestant

bigotry. The war of 1812 had a similar effect. The successive visitations of the cholera and the yellow fever were so many glorious battles for the Church. The convent sisters and the priests sought the posts of danger, plunged into the thick of the fight, and, in many cases, lost their lives nursing the plague-stricken and administering the last rites to the dying. This supernatural heroism was a sign and a wonder to thousands who had no love for Catholicity. The champions of the Church have won their immortal garlands in the closed lists of the lazar-houses, where death shook his dart, or out on the battle-field in the midst of the wounded.

We cannot go into the secondary causes of the great growth of the Church, but will remark that the civil war added greatly to her prestige, and well-nigh dispersed all the old prejudices. This was made evident when, not long since, a red-robed cardinal and an archbishop were called upon to participate officially, and offer up prayers to God, at a great national commemoration. The manifest truth is that the Catholic Church in the United States emerges with new lustre from every ordeal it encounters. It has proved equal to every emergency. It will be a more potent influence in the Conemaugh Valley henceforth than it has been. Pure and heroic lives are great missionaries in this day and country. They always have been, we suppose. Pulpiteering and pamphleteering are feeble in comparison. The Church numbers among her children, in and out of the cloister, men and women of pure and heroic life who are not unwilling to sacrifice themselves, and win the martyr's crown, when occasion calls. The law of the growth of the Church is elucidated by this fact. Of course, our numerical strength is another question, and is largely accounted for by immigration—a cause to which the growth and prosperity of the whole United States are immeasurably indebted. But *emigration* is a forced movement,—a movement impelled by necessity,—and is considered by the emigrant himself and the family a sore hardship and great peril. Yet, in the order of PROVIDENCE, it is one of the laws of human progress, and has been in force from the beginning. We have seen what great results have sprung from it in this country, although its victims have been many, and are once more admonished that GOD continues to make men's necessities instruments for working out a great intent.

Scientific Chronicle.

PHOTOGRAPHY.

PHOTOGRAPHY is now fifty years old. A half century of greater progress and usefulness cannot well be imagined. Interesting in her infancy, but with little promise of her power, she has become the invaluable helpmate of science. This widening of her sphere of usefulness has been chiefly due to the chemist, who, by his untiring labors, has increased the sensitiveness of the photographic plate, and simplified the process of its development. But the optician, by the perfection of his lenses, and the mechanic, by the skill with which he has confined all the necessary mechanical appliances in a neat and compact camera, have contributed greatly to the perfection of the picture, and the universal spread of a process destined to have an important influence on science, literature, and art.

The camera has remained essentially the same, and the relation of its parts is easily understood from the well known comparison with the human eye. The box corresponds to the dark chamber of the eye, while the sensitive plate, held in place at the back of the camera-box, is the retina on which the lens focuses the picture, as the crystalline lens does in the eye. The diaphragm acts as iris and pupil, regulating the amount of light admitted to the lens, while the shutter plays the part of the eyelid. The photographic shutter, though, is about ten times more rapid than the eyelid, an exposure of the $\frac{1}{100}$ of a second being attained. This short exposure is sometimes secured in the following way: In front of the diaphragm two circular shutters rigidly connected are revolved about the same axis by means of a strong spring. A brake holds them in a given position, so that one of them covers the aperture and the other is held some distance above. The brake is attached to a piston fitted in one extremity of a rubber tube, the other end of which terminates in a rubber ball held by the operator. Squeezing the rubber ball, the air in the tube is compressed, the piston raised, and the brake released. The spring revolves the shutters until the upper one has replaced the lower over the aperture, thus exposing the plate during the time it took to effect this change of position. When several instantaneous pictures are to be taken of the successive positions of a body in rapid motion, electricity is employed to regulate the motion of the shutter, as in the case of the Muybridge series of photographs illustrating animal locomotion. In this instance an exposure of $\frac{1}{8000}$ part of a second was secured.

But the chief improvement has been made in the plate. In 1839 Daguerre, a French painter, announced his discovery to the world. His pictures were made in the following way: Exposing a highly polished plate of silvered copper to the vapor of iodine, it became sensitive to light. When such a plate was placed in the camera an invisible image

of an object placed before the camera was printed upon it. This picture was brought out by the action of vapor of mercury, and the plate rendered insensible to the further action of light by washing it in hyposulphite of soda to remove the superfluous salt of silver, and in water to remove the hyposulphite. At the same time, Fox Talbot, in England, made known his discovery of what he called "Photogenic Drawings." He coated writing paper with a solution of common salt. When dry he brushed silver nitrate over it, thus forming silver chloride on the paper. The picture printed on this paper was developed by gallic acid. It was negative, but on covering a similar sheet of sensitive paper with the one on which the negative was made, and allowing the light to act through the latter, a positive was formed.

Thus the action of light on the salts of silver is the basis of the whole operation. The salts employed at present are the bromide and the iodide, but the plate is much more easily coated with the salts than in the processes above described. In 1843, Sir John Herschel had taken a picture of his great telescope on a glass plate. But Niépce de St. Victor advanced this method by employing albumen to hold the salts on the glass. Later, Le Gray suggested the use of collodion instead of albumen, and in 1851 Scott Archer introduced the collodion process in the form in which we find it to-day. At present it is known as the wet-plate process. The plate must be prepared by the photographer, and is used while wet. Collodion, containing soluble iodides or bromides, is poured upon the glass until a thin film of the collodion covers the glass, all superfluous liquid being removed. The plate is then placed in a bath of nitrate of silver. Iodide of silver is formed upon the plate, a coat of the nitrate also adhering to the film. It is now ready for use, and on exposure in the camera a latent picture is printed upon it. Any one of the many developers in use, such as sulphate of iron, poured upon the plate, brings out the picture. Then washing in hyposulphite of soda, and finally in water, it is rendered insensible to the further action of light.

The fact that the operator had to prepare his plate every time he wished to take a picture made the process long, and increased the amount of stock necessary for the photographer. So, a great advance was made by the introduction of the dry plate. M. Gaudin, in 1854, brought out the collodion dry plate, and Dr. R. L. Maddox the far more sensitive gelatine plate in 1871. In this latter gelatine is the vehicle for distributing and holding the silver salts on the plate, which is used while dry. Thus, the photographer can dispense with all that was necessary to prepare the plate, which he can secure ready for use in any photographic supply store. He merely requires the chemicals necessary for developing the picture. The employment of glass as the material on which the negative is formed was a decided advance on account of the transparency of glass. But its weight renders it objectionable. Hence, several inventors have had recourse to different methods of taking negatives on transparent media, which would be light and durable. Oil paper was abandoned, as the structure of the paper interfered with the distinctness of the positive.

The process of stripping the film from a temporary paper back, and using the transparent film to print from, is too troublesome unless done on a large scale. So the most practical method yet devised seems to be that in which celluloid is employed to hold the film. It makes a light, transparent plate, which can be easily retained in proper position while printing.

The chemical action which occurs on the plate under the action of light is a subject of much discussion. The result for the wet plate may be briefly stated thus: On the plate we have iodide (or bromide) and nitrate of silver; the light breaks up the iodide into the subiodide of silver and iodine. The latter is absorbed by the silver nitrate, forming nitric acid and silver iodide. When the plate in this condition is brought to the dark room and washed with ferrous sulphate, the silver nitrate is acted on with the formation of ferric sulphate, ferric nitrate, and metallic silver. The latter is attracted to the parts of the plate acted upon by the light, giving us a metallic silver image of the object. By polishing a positive made on glass the beautiful and brilliant lustre of the image will reveal the fact that it is of metallic silver. The washing of the picture with hyposulphite is to remove the salts of silver which have not been acted upon by the light. The washing in water is necessary to remove the hyposulphite, which would stain the photograph.

Although the method of taking photographs has been simplified, and thousands of amateurs have entered the field, still patience and skill are required to take a good picture. Attention must be paid to the proper lighting of the subject and to the time of exposure. Success in these points will come only after considerable experience. But the advantages to be reaped from success in the art have induced many to study carefully all the requisite conditions, and produce results which have important bearings in the different departments of science.

To photography we owe a great advance in our knowledge of animal locomotion which may be of practical value in the hands of the physician while treating locomotor ataxia, lateral sclerosis, and the like. We have not given up the thought of flying in the air, and if the problem is to be solved, probably nothing will contribute so much to success as the exact knowledge which photography has given us of the flight of birds. The astronomer, too, has called photography to his aid in unravelling the mysteries of the heavens. No great astronomical expedition to observe an important eclipse is now complete without its photographic outfit to record accurately the phenomena. These pictures bring out details which would have escaped the observer. Sir John Herschel is said to have remarked, on looking at a photograph of Saturn taken by Warren De la Rue, that he would die content if he could but once see the planet itself as beautifully defined. It was by means of photography that De la Rue, in 1860, succeeded in locating the prominences in the gaseous envelope around the sun. From two series of photographs taken during the eclipse of that year, one by himself and the other by Father Secchi, S. J., he arrived at this conclusion, which repeated experiments have since confirmed. The first application of photography to

astronomy was made by John William Draper, of New York, on March 23, 1840, when he secured a Daguerreotype picture of the moon. Since that day the camera has been the inseparable companion of the telescope in the observatory, revealing new nebulæ and stars never seen by the eye. But that it may supplant the eye in determining star positions, some substance must be discovered that will preserve the gelatine film with its record from shrinkage.

The physicist calls photography to his aid while examining the spectra of metals, and the rapidity and accuracy with which the spectroscopic lines are recorded is truly marvellous. Where weeks of observation would be required to detect and measure the lines, and where this would be impossible for the eye on account of their great number and delicacy, the sensitive plate makes, in a few minutes, a perfect record which can be examined at leisure by the observer. The valuable spectroscopic maps of Prof. Rowland of Johns Hopkins University are admirable illustrations of the power of photography in this field. The value of an uninterrupted series of observations in the case of continuous phenomena is evident, and the sensitive plate is the tireless watcher that night and day records in our physical laboratories and meteorological observatories the variations in many of our physical forces. A general view of the methods employed may be gathered from the way in which changes in the earth's magnetism are recorded. A magnetic needle is suspended so as to be influenced by the action of the earth. Each variation in the magnetism of the earth causes an oscillation of the needle. A small mirror attached to the needle reflects a slender beam of light to a roll of sensitive paper which is moved slowly by clock-work. This bright spot imprints on the paper every movement of the needle with a faithfulness unattainable by the most skilful observer.

But art as well as science profits by photography. Not that the photograph itself is, strictly speaking, a work of art. It is rather scientific than artistic, for it reproduces with the strictest accuracy every little fact of detail, while it is the aim of the artist to express his subject by employing as few facts as possible. Still, the spread of photography has obliged thousands to study composition or arrangement of parts that they may mutually aid each other in producing a pleasing result, as well as the effect of light and shade, a knowledge of which is necessary for the proper appreciation of a work of art, as well as for its production. An artistic spirit is also fostered by placing in the hands of the public faithful photographic reproductions of the works of great artists. No work of travel is now complete unless the photographs taken by the traveller are reproduced, and literary works are enhanced by copious illustrations which are daily improved by new photographic processes.

A cannon ball moving at the rate of 1200 feet per second has been photographed, the lightning flash has been faithfully recorded and yet we do not seem to have exhausted the possibilities of photography, and achievements in this field during the next fifty years may far surpass those of the half century just closed.

FORESTS AND RAIN-FALL.

IN many of the States a holiday has been established by law and is known as Arbor Day. The object of this day of recreation is to foster a love for our forests and to encourage tree-planting in order that the destruction of our trees in the path of advancing civilization may in some measure be compensated for. Hence it is that in many places the school children are instructed to plant trees and to take pride in watching their growth. This is the reaction that must necessarily follow the evils that threaten us if a wholesale destruction of our forests be permitted. We need not go to Europe to learn the sad consequences of disafforesting a country. In the last report of the Forestry Commission of the State of New York we learn that the summer flow of the Adirondack rivers has decreased, within the memory of men now living, from 30 to 50 per cent. That many of the small streams which a quarter of a century ago were abundantly supplied with water during the entire summer are now dry during many months.

This is what might be expected, for in open country the sun acts with its full force on the snow in spring, melts it rapidly, giving rise to early spring freshets and floods which carry devastation in their path and rob the rocks of the soil that covers them. Whereas in forest-covered tracts, the trees shield the snow from the direct action of the sun's rays, it melts more slowly, gentle streams are gradually supplied with water, and much that would have been carried off to the sea by the more rapid surface-drainage has time to penetrate the soil, supplying springs and small streams for months afterwards. Moreover, the rapid denudation of the rocks is thus prevented and much valuable soil preserved for tillage. Similar effects are produced in the case of heavy rains; there is a slow, equable and gradual distribution of the water through the agency of forests, whereas in open country it is drained at once into the beds of the nearest water-courses.

China affords an illustration of the evils that result from destroying the forests. It is a treeless country, visited by devastating floods and by long periods of drought as destructive in their results as the floods. Not long ago the Yellow river overflowed, and with such disastrous consequences that the necessity of increasing wooded areas was forced upon all. The Viceroy, Li Hung Chang, issued a proclamation calling the attention of the people of his province to this fact. The authorities are to furnish trees to the peasants with directions for tree-planting. To encourage the inhabitants to take a lively interest in this enterprise, ten of the benefits that will result from an extension of the wooded areas are printed and circulated with the directions for planting. Chief among these benefits are the reasons which the Viceroy gives for issuing this proclamation. He says a new means of livelihood will be given to the peasants, droughts will be prevented, floods checked, rain-fall regulated and the country beautified.

The evils of forest destruction have long since been felt in Europe, and in 1872 five million young trees were in cultivation in Dalmatia

alone in order to repair the damage. In India the forests produce valuable teak and ornamental woods for cabinet-work, but their destruction produced serious consequences to the climate; droughts, famine, and floods being invariably the result. Algeria repeats the tale of India. So abundant are the facts that there is no difficulty in tracing the relation of cause and effect between the destruction of forests and floods, famine, and droughts. Where attention has been paid to vegetation these evils have been checked. In the French Department of the Hautes Alpes an interesting experiment was tried some years ago. The land had been washed away by the water, the mountain villages abandoned, and in twenty years the population had decreased by eleven thousand. The peasants opposed the replacing of the forests, but were obliged to returf the barren districts. This fresh covering of the soil prevented evaporation, and allowed the rain to sink into the earth instead of running off in torrents, washing the soil away with it. The result was most happy. In a few years these districts were covered with a luxuriant vegetation, giving food and shelter to flocks and herds.

Whether forests have a direct influence on agriculture by increasing the yearly rain-fall is much disputed, but as the methods of observation are improved, and the areas over which these observations are made are increased, facts seem to confirm the opinion that they do. For the raising of wheat, for example, a mean yearly rain-fall of twenty inches seems to be generally required, although there are instances of its successful growth with only fifteen inches of rain in the year. This water, where there are no artificial systems of irrigation, must come from the atmosphere. The atmosphere absorbs this water from seas, lakes, rivers, etc., and when saturated, through the agency of the winds, scatters it over the land. But, in many instances, the air is robbed of its moisture before reaching inland districts, and, hence, in these places there will be a deficit of water unless it can be supplied from some other source. Now, forests act as large store-houses of water, and dry winds blowing over them absorb immense quantities of water, which is precipitated over agricultural and grazing lands. The instances of increase of rain-fall coincident with preservation and extension of forest land confirms this opinion. Mr. Henry Blanford, meteorologist to the government of India, in his report for 1885-86, expresses the opinion that the increased rain-fall is due in a great measure to the preservation of the forests. Formerly the natives, in accordance with their nomadic system of cultivation, destroyed large forest tracts by jungle fires, but, in 1875, the government brought these districts under protection, and since then the wooded areas have increased; and coincident with this growth there has been, during the last ten years, an increase of 10 per cent. in the rain-fall. In a valuable report lately published from the Signal Office giving the "Rain-fall of the Pacific Slope and the Western States and Territories," the Chief Signal Officer, Gen. A. W. Greely, deduces from the observations, which range over a period of from two to forty years, that the rain-fall is increasing, and that the forests are a factor in this increase. He says: "The effect of forests as factors in the increase of rain-fall is

more or less questioned, but the weight of opinion and of accumulative evidence tends to confirm the theory that forests do slightly increase the rain-fall. The confining of Indians to reservations has removed one fruitful cause of fires during the last ten years, so that the stunted forests are having an opportunity of increasing the limit only by the operation of natural laws. The immense number of planted and cultivated trees over the great plains of Kansas and Nebraska will undoubtedly contribute their part in the coming years toward the increase of rain-fall, and, what is more important, its substantial retention in the soil, and more slow and equal distribution than was possible when the same amount of rain fell upon a hardened, open prairie, and without the intervention of loosened soil and vegetation, drained at once as torrents into the beds of the nearest water-courses." But trees restore moisture to the atmosphere in another way. During active vegetation, immense quantities of water are exhaled from the leaves. Hales' experiment with a sunflower $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet high, and with a surface of 5616 square inches, showed that it perspired at the rate of about 25 ounces of water every 12 hours. This amount will vary with the warmth and dryness of the air. Hence we can see the utility of trees in dry climates to supply moisture to the atmosphere. In 1870, Von Pettenkofer communicated to the Munich Academy of Science the result of his experiments on an oak tree during its summer growth. He found that the amount of water exhaled steadily increased from May to July, and then decreased until October. The number of leaves on the tree was estimated at 751,592, and the evaporation was 539.16 centimeters of water. The rain-fall during the same period on the area covered by the tree was 65 centimeters. Hence the evaporation was $8\frac{1}{3}$ times the rain-fall. This excess was drawn up by the roots from a considerable depth. Thus we see that trees are constantly acting pumps, which prevent the drying of a climate by restoring to the air the moisture which would otherwise be carried to the sea by streams and rivers. Removal of forests increases the amount of water carried to the sea, and decreases the amount which, returned to the atmosphere, condenses into cloud and rain. Under certain circumstances this may be good, but carried to excess the climate may become too dry for the profitable pursuit of agriculture. This action of forests of which we have been speaking is illustrated by the descriptions lately received from Stanley of the humid climate of the Aruwihimi forests. This is to be explained as suggested by H. F. Blandford, in *Nature*, by the re-precipitation of the moisture of the forest, which is carried upward by the ascending equatorial air currents.

Without considering the beneficial effects of wooded districts on the health of a community, we have sufficient reason in what has been pointed out to make us guard them jealously, and adopt measures to extend them over districts unfit for cultivation but admirably suited for the growth of trees.

ORIGIN OF PETROLEUM.

Two theories have been put forward to explain the origin of petroleum. One states that its origin is inorganic, the other that it is organic. According to the first, as defended especially by Mendelejeff, water penetrating through the surface of the earth comes in contact with carburets of iron and other metals which are highly heated. A chemical action ensues which results in the formation of oxides of the metals and hydrocarbons. The latter are condensed in the cooler parts of the earth's crust, the liquid product being our petroleum. Mendelejeff was led to this belief from the fact that petroleum occurs in some places in Tertiary, while in others it is found in the Devonian and Silurian strata. Hence, according to his theory, it was condensed in these strata as it rose from lower ones where it was formed and in which few organic remains are found. In support of this view, Mendelejeff formed in the laboratory, by reactions similar to those supposed to take place in the earth, hydrocarbons resembling petroleum.

But the weight of geological and chemical opinion is in favor of the organic origin of petroleum. Some claim that it is formed by the distillation at a very high temperature of bituminous coal, others that it is formed at ordinary temperatures by the distillation of other organic matter. The fact that the whole petroleum series may be artificially made by the distillation of coal is evidence in favor of the former view. In support of the second theory, we find fossil cavities in limestone filled with bitumen which was evidently formed by the decomposition of the organic matter. Fossil fish, too, entirely changed into bitumen have been found in many shales, notably in Scotland. Hence, the most common opinion at present is that coal and oil have been formed from organic matter, the former from plants in the presence of fresh water, the latter from plants and animals in the presence of salt-water. The frequent association of oil and salt seems to justify the assumption, that salt-water played a part in the formation of petroleum. An important contribution to the literature of this subject has been lately made by the German chemist, C. Engler, who, acting on the suggestion of Kramer & Bottger, that certain hydrocarbons found in petroleum were formed by the distillation of organic matter at a comparatively low temperature and under high pressure, performed the experiment with very happy results. He distilled one thousand pounds of menhaden oil at a temperature ranging from 350° to 400° , and under a pressure of two atmospheres. The result of the distillation was a combustible gas, water and six hundred pounds of oil resembling very closely crude petroleum. Twenty-six per cent. of this oil boiled below 150° , and by a fractional distillation of this portion he isolated pentane, hexane, heptane, octane and nonane of the paraffine series. He also found certain members of the ethene series which also occur in petroleum, thus establishing an identity between this oil and that portion of petroleum which boils below 150° . The experimenter further confirmed this result by distilling the constituents of fish oil. Engler then calculated the amount of

carbon and hydrogen that should remain in the oil on the supposition that all the oxygen of triolein and tristearin, two of the compounds distilled, combined with part of the hydrogen to form water. The calculation gives a residue of 87 per cent. of carbon and 13 per cent. of hydrogen. Here we have a very striking coincidence, since many analyses of American and European petroleums made by distinguished chemists give exactly this percentage of carbon and hydrogen in crude petroleum. Thus we have in these experiments a further confirmation of the organic origin of petroleum which geologically is universally associated with fossiliferous strata.

Book Notices.

LE SOCIALISME D'ÉTAT ET LA RÉFORME SOCIALE. Par *Claudio Jannet*, Professeur d'Économie Politique, etc.; pp. xvi-544. Librairie Plon. Paris. 1889.

M. Claudio Jannet's valuable work, *Les Etats Unis Contemporains*, has made his name familiar to Americans. His latest publication, *Le Socialisme d'Etat*, will add to his well-earned reputation as a political economist, a teacher and a writer. The work is practical, sound in principle, broadly conservative, and crowded with facts illustrating the recent development of economic and social movements in Europe. Here where we have few, if any, trained Catholic professors who devote themselves wholly to the study and presentation of the social problems of the day, M. Jannet's work will be welcomed as a sound and helpful guide. Our journalists, legislators, employers—even our learned college debaters—can acquire from M. Jannet a fuller understanding of the various theories that are current to-day; of the factors that complicate the various questions at issue; of legislation that has been effected, or that is called for; of dangers that threaten the social structure; of remedies that have been suggested and tried, and of others that right reason points out.

Though we have had a costly experience of the most logical of all forms of Socialism—Anarchism—there are many optimists who try to convince themselves that Socialism is, by its nature, wholly European, and that Americans have nothing to fear from it. The optimists have not learned that Socialism is a religion as well as a political creed. It is the Protestantism of the last quarter of the 19th century—no more un-American than un-German or un-English. If we are able to defend ourselves against its inroads, our success will be owing to our acquaintance with its purposes and methods, as these have been developed in every European country. In M. Claudio Jannet's volume the reader will find a thorough exposition of the doctrines and the machinery of European Socialism; and, what is of equal importance, a full and direct answer to the Socialist claims; an answer based on the teachings of Christianity, on reason, on the principles of a sound economy, and on facts. From beginning to end, M. Jannet's book is an answer to So-

cialism, of whatever kind : Revolutionary Socialism, scientific Socialism, so-called Christian Socialism, and state Socialism. In his study, the author confines himself to no single country or period. He is a historian of the past as well as of the present.

In Germany we find the most advanced forms of "Christian," anti-Christian, and state Socialism. To Germany, therefore, M. Jannet pays especial attention. Though all countries, not excepting our own, have recently tried their hand at legislation of a character that may be called socialistic, Germany, under Prince von Bismarck's lead, has adopted measures whose radicalism is not to be mistaken. These various measures, especially the Insurance Laws, M. Jannet discusses at length ; not merely sketching their details, but also considering the principles that underlie these laws, their practicability, their economic and their political bearings. His presentation and discussion are thorough, and all the more valuable on account of the opportunity M. Jannet affords the reader of comparing the German schemes with those formulated in other countries.

The modern idea of the state—especially the German idea—is that of an entity whose powers have neither beginning nor end. And yet, what is the modern State, practically? M. Leroy-Beaulieu has recently given an answer which is extremely simple, and, at the same time, thoughtful. The state is "the men whom chance or the inconsistency of the elections has momentarily lifted into power." It would be hard to find reasons in defense of the absolutism of a state which answered to this definition. On the other hand, prudence would teach the people that they cannot be too watchful of their rights as against such a state. M. Jannet, who is a democrat in the right sense of the word, treats dispassionately the question of state interference in social and economic reforms, and the limits within which the state may or should act. These are matters on which it is imperative that the people should have just and exact views. The future of our Christian civilization largely depends on a solution of the social problems at the least possible sacrifice of individual liberty. The people will be secure, indeed, if they accept M. Jannet's view of government, which he well defines as neither more nor less than an administration, whose duty it is to look to the best interests of all the people.

M. Jannet is a believer in the liberty of labor—the liberty of each individual to choose his own trade or profession, to exercise it where he pleases, and to exercise it in the way he pleases—provided, always, that, under the plea of liberty, the moral law is not violated. With labor thus free, and the state keeping strictly within its limits, "not taking from one to give to another, not clogging the movements of one class in order to make those of another class more free," but "doing what it can to make the means of production easier for all," there is no economic problem that the citizens cannot solve by themselves, provided they keep well in view the teachings of Christianity. There is M. Jannet's position, and it is the only reasonable position for the intelligent Christian.

Association, combination, from these spring many of the social evils of which we complain to-day. Not because associations, combinations, are bad in themselves, but because we have not as yet accommodated ourselves to the conditions of which they are only an expression. In association M. Jannet finds a potent remedy for the very evils we suffer from. And his argument is convincing ; for it is an argument whose every word is a fact—facts drawn from Germany, France, England, Belgium, Austria, Italy. Organized self-help has effected wonderful things for workers of all kinds. No code of special laws could have done for mechanics and

farmers what the admirable co-operative associations have done for them. Here we have hardly begun to appreciate the value of co-operation, and many American readers of M. Jannet's book will learn for the first time of the extended application of the principle of co-operation in Europe.

While determining the limits of state action, M. Jannet is careful to point out where the law can act advantageously, and he instances many useful laws that have been put into execution of late. In America we have not to face the problems of the Old World that are a consequence of ancient statutes providing for the transmission of real property in the family—laws based on a condition of society that no longer exists. In chapter iv. M. Jannet gives a most interesting account of the steps by which a radical reform was recently effected in the German laws of inheritance, a reform initiated by the people themselves. The notion that the people do not know what they want, and that legislators do, is too common, even in some ideal democracies. It is encouraging to see the citizens of an imperial government providing for their own welfare without passionate debates, divisions, politics, or bribery.

Neither laws nor self-help can cure all the ills of society. M. Jannet enforces this fact on his readers. There is, and always will be, a place for charity. The obligations of charity M. Jannet sets forth clearly. He does more; he shows what Christian charity has done and is doing, in Europe, to relieve the sufferings of the poor. It is a beautiful story. American Catholics will learn from M. Jannet's book that they have not yet methodized charity as have their French and German brethren. The very best minds have given themselves to a study of the wants of the poor, and to the most effective means of supplying them, not in a temporary way, but with a view to permanent benefit.

We said that M. Jannet's book was crowded with facts and discussions. In a short notice it would be impossible to do the work justice, or even to convey a fair notion of its contents. The rights and duties of employer and employed, the duties of corporations, apprenticeship, legal limitation of the hours of labor, Sunday work, monopolies, trusts, land ownership, state savings-banks, protection and free trade—every moving question of the day is handled with clearness, precision, and the largest knowledge. The book is a compendium of the recent history of European social movements. It is a work not only of detail, of research, not only a work of information, but also of deep thought; and certainly the best work of its kind that has come from Catholic hands.

The social problems of our own country will not be solved by the aid of uninformed, hasty, theoretic writers and speakers. Calm, reflective, studious, broad-minded, practical, religious men can alone help us to see our way aright. M. Claudio Jannet is one of the few who, appreciating the importance of the questions that disturb our modern society, approach them with a full mind, a large intelligence, and a generous heart. As Catholics we feel a pride in his exceptional work, which we hope may find its way into non-Catholic as well as Catholic hands.

LIVES OF THE FATHERS; OR, SKETCHES OF CHURCH HISTORY IN BIOGRAPHY. By *Frederick W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.* New York: Macmillan & Co. 1889.

The distinctive characteristics of Canon Farrar's writings are so well known that it seems almost needless to say that the style of this work is that of pure limpid English. The descriptions, graphic and lifelike, and the narrative in each biography flow on without a break or needless

episode to distract the reader's attention from the main subject or cause fatigue. There is not a dry or tedious paragraph from beginning to end of the two volumes which make up the work.

The object of the author, as he states it in his preface, is not to write a full and continuous history of the early Church, but "rather to connect the history of the Church during the first four centuries with the lives of her principal fathers and teachers." He is encouraged to attempt this by the fact that "though the interest which attaches to the human and personal element of biography is, to a certain extent, separable from it, yet is so closely connected with it that biography and history serve the purpose of mutual illustration, so that any one who is familiar with the lives of the chief Church writers will scarcely be ignorant of any event of capital importance which occurred during the epoch in which they lived."

The author, as a further reason for his work, says that though much has been written on the subject, yet, "apart from histories of the Church or of Christianity, there have been but few attempts since the days of Cave to write consecutively the lives of the fathers." This statement, to those who are at all acquainted with the labors in this field of Newman and many other eminent scholars in England and on the European continent, seems not only a too sweeping assertion, but one also which can only obtain acceptance with persons who are not acquainted with the writings of those learned scholars.

Canon Farrar gives a list of the numerous authors whom he has consulted, but declares that he is

"Nullius addictus jurare in verbo magistri,"

and that he has "repeatedly exercised" his "own judgment upon the original sources."

This statement is a plain and truthful declaration of the spirit in which Canon Farrar writes. He does not feel at liberty to set aside with scant courtesy the second-hand testimonies of scholars and writers who lived much nearer to the times of the early Church fathers and had means of knowing them and judging of them which now no longer exist; but, in the exercise of his own personal judgment, he rejects and ignores as of no importance, and, indeed, as the spurious productions of "the many superstitions which infected the pure faith of Christianity," facts of deepest significance which are testified to by contemporaneous writers of unquestionable credibility.

The only discoverable reason for this is that those facts contradict Canon Farrar's personal theory of the nature of the Church, the manner of its growth, and the relation of those Church fathers to the doctrine and discipline of the Church. For those fathers and teachers, personally, the author professes "the deepest respect, fully sympathizing with them in their difficulties and trials." He "acknowledges their greatness and the greatness of their services to the cause of Christianity," "even when" he thinks "it right to point out their necessary limitations," which "limitations," the author's theory, it is almost needless to say, necessarily not only dwarfs the greatness of those Church fathers, but reduces to a minimum their actual services to Christianity. For they were not only fallible men, but, according to the author's judgment, were deeply tinged with the superstitions of the age; were violent partisans, and so violent, too, in their personal prejudices and their personal likes and dislikes that wilful falsification and misrepresentation were common among them, and they were more zealous in propagating and defending the ideas

of the different schools of thought and factions to which they respectively belonged than for the growth of pure religion. They were great men, good men, but after all were products of the ages in which they lived and of their personal environments.

Canon Farrar commences his series of sketches with a biography of St. Ignatius. Of previous writers he thinks that though we have a few writings of Christian teachers, one or two of which may date back to the life-time of St. John, of their authors "we know little or nothing." To the so-called "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," professedly discovered by Bishop Briennios, in 1883, he seems to attach great importance, though coming "from an unknown source." He thinks it throws "a strange and interesting light over the simple organization, faith, and worship of the early communities of Christians. In marked contrast with this, he attaches but little importance to the beautiful and suggestive letter of St. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, the authenticity of which is indisputable, and of St. Clement personally he says we can know nothing" beyond the fact that he was "an early bishop of Rome." As for the epistle itself, he finds in it "great purity of moral tone and spiritual intuition," and "interesting glimpses of facts respecting the imprisonment of St. Paul, and the early female Christian martyrs, but characterizes it as "a mosaic of second-hand phrases and "loose quotations," and as drawing "unauthorized arguments from misquoted texts of sacred scripture."

In the biographical sketch of St. Ignatius, an account is given of his examination by the Emperor Trajan, and of the route by which he was probably taken to Rome. His epistles to the different churches to which he wrote are analyzed, particular stress being laid upon his earnest exhortations against Docetism; but what gives their chief historical value to these epistles are their references to the authority of priests and bishops over the laity, and the distinctions made between the two orders are explained by the theory that "the language of the martyr comes to us with very different *connotations* from those which correspond to its real meaning. . . . Though we find in Ignatius the growth of the hierarchic system, yet there is in the genuine Ignatius no trace of sacerdotalism. . . . He is not writing a scheme of theology or even of church government, but only occasional letters."

This last statement is true, but Canon Farrar seems unable to see that this very fact gives all the more importance to St. Ignatius's letters as historical evidence as to what the actual government of the Church was in that early age. He says that St. Ignatius's remarks about the authority of the bishop and the sin of disobeying him would be "simply blasphemous if they were extended into universal propositions, wholly apart from the special circumstances under which they were written. . . . He does not speak of bishops as *instituted* by the Apostles." He nowhere represents them as *successors* of the Apostles. His bishop is a *parochial* pastor. His testimony is confined to the churches in Asia, and "he nowhere disparages other forms of church-government." . . . "The bishop of Ignatius is not a marchical bishop, nor even a diocesan; he is a congregational bishop."

After thus showing the spirit and manner in which Canon Farrar deals with St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch, it is needless, we think, to take up separately the other sketches which make up these volumes. They consist of painstaking studies of all the most distinguished fathers of the Church and their writings down to St. Chrysostom. They also comprise disquisitions on Tertullian's controversial and Montanistic writings, the influence of Origen, the dawn of Arianism,

the Council of Nice, on monasticism and asceticism, with notes on the early bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, and on the heretics of the first four centuries. These studies and sketches are learned, and the author's statements are seemingly fortified by numerous references to original historical sources. But the coloring and perspective of the pictures are such that in reality they falsify the real characteristics of the Christianity and of the Church fathers of those early ages. The practices and belief of the Christians of those ages are measured and tested by the prevalent notions of modern liberalism and rationalism. Accounts of well-attested miracles are treated as mythical stories; the high esteem in which virginity was held is characterized as one of the errors of those ages, and so, too, are other ideas and doctrines which were then plainly conspicuous in the Catholic Church as they now are, but which are denied by Protestants and rationalists. The fact, too plain to be denied, of the authority exercised by the Bishop of Rome over all other bishops and wherever Christianity had spread, is attributed to political and other like causes.

The result of this is that, taking the work as a whole, it is a series of stories, learned, minute, and life-like, about the Church fathers, as the writer in his dogmatic liberalism conceives that those fathers ought to have been, according to his personal ideas; but as biographies they are misleading, one-sided, and partial.

ELEMENTS OF ECCLESIASTICAL LAW. Vol. III. Ecclesiastical Punishments. By *Rev. S. B. Smith*, formerly Professor of Canon Law, Author of "Notes," etc. New York, St. Louis and Einsiedeln: Benziger Brothers.

"After fifteen years of ceaseless toil and unwearied study, we have at last finished these Elements of Ecclesiastical Law." So writes Father Smith in the preface to his latest work.

Fifteen years of ceaseless toil and unwearied study! It bespeaks much self-denial, many sacrifices, praiseworthy zeal. But the prize is worth it all and more. Father Smith has completed a great work. He has done his brothers of the priesthood, in the English-speaking world, a great service. He has done very much to advance on earth the interests of God and His Church. That Father Smith has written his work in English has been made the occasion of serious objection. Latin, it is true, is the language of the Church, her mother-tongue, whose study, therefore, should be fostered and stimulated in every possible way. And yet for all that, we think it good that the "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law" have been given us in the English tongue. All priests are familiar with Latin—some more, some less. But all are sufficiently conversant with the tongue to read it without much difficulty. Yet there is not a doubt but that almost all of us turn more readily to an English than to a Latin work. To say so much may not be to our credit, yet the fact is plain. Given to us in the English language, we do not hesitate to say that Father Smith's work will be read and studied by many who, were it written in Latin, would pass it by. This we hold to be a great good.

In the seminaries of this country, and, we believe, in those of other English-speaking countries, canon law has been, and largely is still, an unknown quantity. In some of the older works of theology, now no longer studied in our seminaries, it was sought, both in the general plan of these works and by some little attention to the subject of law, to supply the deficiency. But the result in no way corresponded to the intention. It is not going too far to say that of the *corpus juris* of the Church, and of the working and procedure in the application of her

laws, our students and clergy generally have been entirely ignorant. That this has been the fruitful source of many sad mistakes, much scandal, and often of great injustice, there cannot be a doubt. Wrongs have been done in the name of the Church and of justice, and by well-meaning and conscientious men, that can never in this world be righted; and which certainly never would have been done if the laws of the Church and the rights of her clergy had been understood. These considerations, and others of greater importance which suggest themselves, emphasize the necessity of a thorough knowledge of canon law on the part of the clergy generally; and now, more than ever, that we have practically a canon law for the Church in this country.

The present volume of Father Smith's work deals with ecclesiastical punishments. As the rev. author says in his preface, it is a subject which grates harshly on the ear, yet we must confess that it is one of the highest importance. He has done his work thoroughly and ably, leaving us nothing to desire.

The Church in her laws has determined the nature and variety of the penalties to be inflicted on her erring subjects. She has defined, too, as it is in her province to define, what actions are punishable, and also the specific penalty attached to each such action. For superiors she has defined most explicitly the method to be followed in imposing these penalties, and for the inferior (subject) the way in which he can protect himself against unmerited punishment.

One by one, distinctly and explicitly, the rev. author explains these several points. Proving the Church's right to inflict punishments upon her subjects, he enters into a minute description of the kinds of punishment she makes use of. The two broad general classes of punishments, he tells us, are preventive and repressive. The *preventive* are those which aim at saving the ecclesiastic already on the inclined plane of evil. The *repressive* are those which aim at bringing back the fallen to the path of duty, and obliterating the consequences of his crime. The chief *preventive* penalties are spiritual exercises, canonical warnings and precept. Reading the author's explanation of these several punishments, one cannot help being impressed by the yearning love of the Church for her clergy, to which they bear testimony. Watching them with eyes as tender and anxious as a mother's, she anticipates the dangers before them and seeks in ways the most loving to save them. With marked clearness and learned minuteness the author explains the nature of these penalties, as well as *how*, by *whom*, and *when* they may be imposed.

Having treated of these *preventive* penalties, Father Smith enters into what rightly may be considered the pre-eminently important part of his task, a description and learned explanation of the *repressive* punishments which the Church has framed and sanctioned for the correction of her erring ecclesiastics. These, he tells us, are of a duplex order—punitive and reformative. The punitive are repressive punishments in the strictest sense, having for their aim the infliction of pain or suffering, as an atonement for and expiation of the illicit pleasure derived from the law's violation. Chief among these penalties are penal transfers, removals from office, disqualification for offices and orders, and infamy. The reformative, though strictly repressive, differ from the punitive in this, that their chief aim is correctional and medicinal, and their remoter object the infliction of punishment. The principal reformative penalties are suspensions, excommunications and interdicts.

To the description and detailed explanation of these several divisions of repressive punishments the author devotes almost three hundred pages

of his work. Following him through these pages, one cannot but feel admiration, again and again, for the task he has undertaken and the manner in which he has accomplished it. Not only does he discuss the broad leading diversions, under which these penalties are classed, but in detail and with learned accuracy everything bearing directly upon the subject matter. Of especial and exceptional interest to us here in the United States is the portion of his work devoted to a consideration of the "Dismissal and Transfer of Irremovable Rectors." For he has treated the subject with a special reference to our time and country, taking into full account the latest instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda and the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.

Very instructive and salutary is the portion of his work which treats of the mention of excommunication. Depending in the past as we generally did on the scant knowledge given us in our theologies concerning the question of excommunication, there is no chapter of the work, we are sure, to which our clergy will turn with more interest. Here we find the subject exhaustively treated, everything bearing upon it explained in the most satisfactory manner. He first gives us a correct notion of excommunication, tells us why and wherefore the Church has framed this punishment, gives us in detail the past and present discipline of the Church concerning it, as well as the effects produced by it.

We cordially recommend Dr. Smith's work. It should find a ready welcome to a place in the library. In form and manner it is all everyone could reasonably desire, written in excellent style, strong, clear, concise. We predict for it a wide circulation. With the better knowledge it will bring, we look for increased harmony and fraternal love, and a closer attachment and a closer adherence to the laws and discipline of the Church.

THE TESTIMONY OF JUSTIN MARTYR TO EARLY CHRISTIANITY. Lectures delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary, in March, 1888. By *George T. Purves, D.D.* New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

The increased attention which, of late years, Protestant scholars are giving to the early Christian writers, is a subject of sincere congratulation. Until recently they almost entirely neglected them, looking upon them as of doubtful authenticity, if not positively spurious, or, even though authentic and genuine, yet at best only the productions of men who, necessarily, were in a great degree ignorant of the New Testament Scriptures, owing to the paucity of copies of its different parts, and owing also to the fact that those parts had not yet been gathered together, and, indeed, no definite conclusion had as yet been arrived at as to what writings were actually inspired and constituted the New Testament. Owing to these well-known facts, Protestants who tenaciously held the fallacious notion that the Sacred Scriptures were the only rule of faith, consistently, though erroneously, regarded the writings of Christians during the early ages of the Church as of very little value. For, according to their false notion of the relation of the Sacred Scriptures to Christian doctrine, they could not but look upon those early Christian writers as very imperfectly acquainted with "pure gospel doctrine." With these erroneous ideas, the only real use consistent Protestants could make of the writings of Christians who lived in times close to that of the Apostles, was to gather up their incidental quotations or paraphrases of separate texts of the Evangelists, of the Acts of the Apostles and their Epistles, and show by them that those inspired writings were extant at those times, and were not the productions of subsequent ages.

But the fact that those who were orally taught by the Apostles themselves, or by their immediate pupils and disciples, must, of necessity, have been well acquainted with Apostolic doctrine, is too significant to be entirely ignored by the more thoughtful of Protestants, however tenaciously they strive to hold to the notion that "the Bible is the only rule of faith." It becomes thus a subject of interest to learn what the Christian of the early ages did really believe, and in investigating this they are confronted with the fact that their belief was substantially that of Catholics of the present day.

In endeavoring to escape the force of this, to them, awkward fact, Protestants commonly resort to one or the other of two methods. The first of these methods is to deny the fact altogether, and to try to give plausibility to their denial by arranging selected passages from early Christian writers in such a way as that their real meaning is obscured, or made to seem just the opposite of what it actually is. The other is to acknowledge the sincerity and piety of the early Christian writers, but to insist that they were infected with heathen or Judæistic notions they had not gotten rid of, or with the errors and superstition which, even in those ages, had commenced corrupting the Christian faith.

The author of the work before us employs both methods. From the very outset of his disquisitions he examines St. Justin's writings from a false point of view. He starts with the notion that the Church, when first established, had no external or other unity except "a moral and spiritual unity." After a time, and by a gradual natural process, "the conflicts of Christianity united the scattered communities of believers into what was practically an external association," yet they "were only united by a common faith and order, a common danger and hope." "The *idea* of the universal Church as a visible society with a definite creed and a prescribed organization was predominating" even at that early time, and the author thinks that "it is important to ask how this state of things was brought about."

It is not surprising that, studying St. Justin's writings with a mind thus preoccupied with erroneous notions of the Church's unity and kindred subjects, the author of the work before us fails to perceive the true meaning and force of the testimonies of that distinguished early Christian Apologist. The references St. Justin makes to the functions and authority of priests and bishops are attributed to his being infected with a spirit of "sacerdotalism" and "ecclesiasticism," his reference to the necessity of good works to "a tendency to Christian *legalism* characteristic of his time." His allusions to "regeneration by baptism," that "in the Eucharist the food over which thanks has been rendered . . . is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh"—these and other testimonies of St. Justin to Catholic doctrine are alleged to be instances how St. Justin "curiously combined with his rationalism a tendency towards a mechanical view of the Sacraments."

The writer has evidently given to his examination of St. Justin's writings much time and study, but, unfortunately, they have been productive of little good, owing to the erroneous manner in which they were employed.

HENRY VIII. AND THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES. An attempt to illustrate the History of their Suppression. By *Francis Aidan Gasquet*, Monk of the Order of St. Benedict, sometime Prior of St. Gregory's Monastery, Dawnside, Bath. Vol. II. London: John Hodges. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

ON receipt of the first volume of this work, we reviewed it at some length, and gave our opinion of its great value, as being made up mainly

of extracts from official documents and letters of Henry VIII. and his chief instruments and tools in suppressing the monasteries of England. The second volume, now before us, confirms what we then said. It shows how Henry VIII. persisted in his scheme of suppressing the English monasteries and appropriated to himself their treasures and revenues. The story is told and the proofs confirming it are given, mainly by extracts from the letters of Henry VIII. and his chief instruments in the work of spoliation, or from other documents heretofore guarded rigidly, but that are now allowed to be examined and copied. The deceit, the treachery and cupidity and utter heartlessness of Henry's character are brought clearly to light from his own letters suggesting to his tools the methods they should employ and the false charges they should concoct against the monks and nuns. But as Henry had necessarily to employ unprincipled persons to carry out his designs, they did not fail to avail themselves of every opportunity to cheat their royal master as well as to rob the monasteries. The sickening story of wanton waste, pilfering, pillage and mock auctions, worse than plain pilfering, is told in the words of the letters and other documents preserved in the English archives. For, as commonly happens in such cases, some of the plunderers exposed the misdeeds of the others.

The work of suppressing the lesser monasteries was first carried into effect by proceedings under Act of Parliament. But, as some escaped through their not falling within the limits of the Act and other causes, the process was adopted of dissolving these and seizing their property and revenues by attainder of their abbots and priors on false charges of complicity with popular uprisings against the ruthless proceedings of Henry's unprincipled commissioners. The heads of the monasteries were mostly put to death, and the monks turned out of their houses to starve or live as best they could. The houses themselves were stripped of everything that could be turned into money, and then destroyed.

The history of the suppression of the convents is also described and the hardships to which the disbanded and expelled nuns were subjected. The treatment of the friars and the proceedings against the three Benedictine Abbots of Glastonbury, Reading and Colchester, and their execution, form two of the blackest chapters in this black history of ruthless spoliation, robbery and murder.

In separate chapters the rising of the people against Henry's tyrannical proceedings, the "Pilgrimage of Grace," and the second northern rising are described. In other chapters details are given of the spoils of the monasteries, and the amounts realized from them, the destruction of books and manuscripts, of works of art and of sacred relics; of the manner in which the spoils were spent or squandered, and the results of the suppression.

In his modest brief prefatory letter to his readers the author says that "the mass of records ready to hand are all instructive and would furnish materials for special monographs on many subjects of deep and present interest." It is to be hoped that he or some one else of like ability, diligence, and carefulness, will avail themselves of the opportunity thus afforded for giving us the true history of the various acts of Henry VIII. and his daughter Elizabeth, from authentic official documents.

A MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR THE USE OF THE CATHOLIC LAITY. Prepared and published by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co.

We have certainly had no stint of prayer-books before the appearance

of this one ; but had there not been room for another it is certain that the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council would not have ordered one to be prepared and published. It was partly because of this very plentifulness that such action was taken for many editions, with all kinds of titles, have been put upon the market, some of them even without episcopal approbation, some still bearing the *imprimatur* of bishops long since dead, and some even, sad to say, appearing with a supposed approval which they had not received. A great many even of the old editions were exact reprints of foreign books that contained matter not suitable for this country, and ignoring matter that should be found in every American prayer-book. Besides, in most cases, the ruling of the authorities in Rome regarding the printing of portions of the Mass and other parts of the liturgy in Latin was not complied with ; and several publishers, in their eagerness to outdo rivals, inserted much matter that should have no place in a prayer-book, as having no reference to any service or function in the Church, but belonging rather to a work of pious reading or instruction. Many prayer-books were thus made far too bulky for general use.

It was with a view to correcting these abuses that the manual before us was ordered to be prepared ; and the priest to whom the work was entrusted has performed his duty faithfully and well. Having, in the first place, used nothing that was of doubtful authority and utility, he then submitted proof-sheets of his work to the inspection of all the bishops of the country, and their views on every point he has strictly complied with. Thus, in having the *imprimatur* of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, the Primate of the United States, and of Archbishop Corrigan, the prelate of the diocese in which the work is published, it has practically the approval of the whole American hierarchy.

Beginning with an illustrated calendar of feasts celebrated in the United States, which is followed by an abridgment of Christian doctrine, it contains, not only various forms of morning and evening prayers, the devotions at Mass, instructions for Confession and Communion, the Way of the Cross, the Rosary and the Scapular, as well as on the sacraments, devotions for the sick and dying, etc., but also the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass, the Vesper service (followed by a directory for finding the psalms and hymns appointed to be sung on Sundays and principal festivals of the Christian year), Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, the blessing of candles, ashes, children, and rosaries, the forms of the sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony and Extreme Unction, the churching of women, the recommendation of a departing soul, the marriage service and nuptial Mass, the burial service and office and Mass for the dead, the hymns and sequences for the Church's seasons, etc., in both Latin and English ; and not only the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and feast days, but also the Introits, Collects and Post-Communions. And especially should every American Catholic be pleased to find in this volume (at page 56) the "Prayer for the Church, the Civil Authorities, etc.," composed by Bishop Carroll in the year 1800, so long omitted, for some unaccountable reason, from all our prayer-books.

The mechanical part of the work deserves a special commendation ; for the typography is absolutely accurate throughout, the letter-press neat and clear, and the paper of the finest quality. In every respect, indeed, this prayer-book deserves to be ranked as a standard work.

PAPERS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY. Volume I. Report and Papers of the First Annual Meeting, held in the City of Washington, December 28, 1888. Edited by *Rev. Samuel Macauley Jackson, M.A.*, Secretary. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1889.

The history of the Church is the history of the progress towards fulfilment of the mission which Christ gave to His Apostles in all ages when about to ascend into heaven. It is the history of the propagation of the faith, of the declaration, definition and manifestation of it by the Church, of the Church's conflicts with error, with her own wilful, disobedient and contumacious members on the one hand, and with the world, its false philosophy, its delusive conclusions of imperfect and superficial so-called science, its cupidity, pride, self-will, ambition, lust, and with those who were influenced by these misleading and corrupting passions, on the other hand. Hence it is evident that Church history is the most important of departments of history, and that its study, when prosecuted sincerely and honestly and with a mind free from prejudice, is productive of richest results.

Therefore we regard as one of the encouraging signs of the times the increasing disposition of late years manifested by Protestant scholars to study Church history from original sources, instead of relying for their knowledge of it upon the one-sided and intentionally misleading representations of it by former partisan Protestant writers. For the more diligently and thoroughly they examine the original documents and writings and other extant monuments, which form the sources of the history of the Church in past ages, the more plainly they will be confronted with evidence that Protestantism is irreconcilably opposed to the faith and practice of Christians not only in mediæval times, but in all ages, including that of the Apostles themselves.

It is true that there is no limit to the false conclusions which even learned scholars may deduce from their investigations of the history of the Church, when they approach the study of it with pre-existing prejudices which they fail to conquer and dismiss, or with a determined purpose to gather from it facts to support previously formed theories. Yet notwithstanding this, truth is mighty and glimpses of it will force themselves into even the most prejudiced minds, and gradually makes its influence felt.

This is plainly shown by an examination of the different papers of which the volume before us is composed. Their evident purpose is to find material for defending Protestantism and arraigning the Catholic Church. Yet, though this is their aim, the manner in which they endeavor to accomplish it is of itself an acknowledgment of the falsity of the methods heretofore pursued by Protestant historical writers, and that grounds on which they attempted to defend Protestantism were untenable. For until recently the line of defense of Protestantism and of assault upon the Catholic Church started with the assumption that the Church remained pure for three or four centuries and then became corrupt. But according to the tenor of the papers in these volumes which touch upon the early ages of Christianity, the same doctrines and practices which Protestants allege to be most mischievous and pernicious corruptions on the part of Catholics in mediæval and modern times, were held by Christians in the ages immediately succeeding that of the Apostles. Thus the writers overthrow one of the fundamental notions of Protestantism and are confronted with the fact that all Christian antiquity opposes them.

The papers in the volume before us referring to ancient Christian times illustrate and confirm what we have said. Those that treat of

"Toleration" and the Spanish Inquisition are fair examples of skilful suppression of some facts and skilful arrangement of others in order to conceal the real truth.

CHURCH HISTORY. By *Professor Kurtz*. Authorized translation from the latest revised edition by the Rev. John Macpherson, M. A. In three volumes. Vol. I. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1889.

Though a thorough work of its kind, and a standard among a certain class of Protestants, yet this history is not one to be recommended to every Catholic reader or even student. From the Catholic standpoint, which we must insist upon as the true one, its basis and plan are erroneous—for it has a set plan, is, in fact, written with the view of establishing a thesis, and is therefore, like Bancroft's "United States," at least as much a work of controversy as of history. The author seems to regard the Church from the branch-theory point of view, as may be judged from the following extract from his introduction, in which there is a good deal of Protestant cant that sounds harsh and offensive to the Catholic ear:

"The Christian Church is to be defined as the one, many-branched communion, consisting of all those who confess that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ who in the fulness of time appeared as the Saviour of the world. It is the Church's special task to render the saving work of Christ increasingly fruitful for all nations and individuals, under all the varying conditions of life and stages of culture. It is the task of Church History to describe the course of development through which the Church as a whole, as well as its special departments and various institutions, has passed from the time of its foundation down to our own day; to show what have been the Church's advances and retrogressions, how it has been furthered and hindered; and to tell the story of its deterioration and renewal."

There are statements here that no genuine Christian can accept, as being in conflict with Christ's promise that He would be with His Church "all days, even to the consummation of the world," and that "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." Indeed, this view has been taken with the apparent object of establishing a necessity for the religious revolution of the sixteenth century; but as the present volume brings the narrative down only to the early Middle Ages, we are not at present in a position to find out how far he attempts to justify this revolution.

From the very beginning of the work, however, there is no lack of erroneous and unsound views. We find nothing to show that the author believes in the divinity of Christ, and in his effort to overthrow the claim of St. Peter's Roman episcopate he conveniently ignores all the recent writings sustaining and proving it. Occasionally, on other points, he quotes Catholic authorities, but not when their views are at variance with his preconceptions. Thus he repeats hackneyed statements of rationalists concerning the Church of the Apostles and of Calvinists on the original position of the Episcopate and the Presbyterate. Once we become acquainted with these points, we need not expect to be pleased with what he has to tell us of heresies, the monastic life and the developments of canon law. The book, therefore, is a good one for ordinary readers to avoid.

But it is not without its use to Catholics. They should have one of their own of similar scope and size in the English language. This want has not yet, properly speaking, been supplied, though we have some good works; but they are either too epitomized, too diffuse, or too learned,

in the sense that they do not popularize the learning that was requisite for compiling them. We are anxious to see in our own tongue such a work, for instance, as an adaptation of Cardinal Hergenröther's "Church History." As things are now, Catholic scholars are in nearly all cases compelled to have recourse to works in foreign languages.

LEAVES FROM THE ANNALS OF THE SISTERS OF MERCY. In four volumes. Volume III., containing sketches of the Order in Newfoundland and the United States. By a Member of the Order of Mercy. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

The zealous and painstaking author of this book is now engaged in working up the material for the fourth volume, which that she may live to finish should be the earnest prayer of every lover of Catholic historical literature. This third instalment is most delightful reading, combining all the interest of a classical romance with the accuracy of a scientific treatise. It is certainly a most valuable addition to the history of the Church in this country.

By far the greater part of the book is devoted to the establishment and growth of the Order of Mercy in the United States, only a short portion treating of Newfoundland, of whose early ecclesiastical history a brief summary is given. Then we have an account of the call to the United States, in which Pennsylvanians especially should take the greatest interest, as it was a call made by a former Philadelphia priest and the first Bishop of the see of Pittsburgh, Rt. Rev. Michael O'Connor, D.D., to whose memory and to whose brother, the present Bishop of Omaha, the volume is dedicated. Incidentally the author gives almost a full history of the early days of the Church in the Pittsburgh diocese, in which the Sisters of Mercy have, from their first establishment there, been a very important factor. Details of their work in other sections are also dwelt upon lovingly, in New York, Chicago, and many other places, on the battlefield during our civil war, and among Chinese and Indians. There are many instances here narrated of the hardships that had to be endured, not merely against poverty, pestilence and other such ills, but against the far more deplorable evil of a rabid bigotry, which even yet has not ceased to break out occasionally, only, however, to show the supernatural character of the agency that supports such works as those in which the Sisters of Mercy are engaged.

OLD ENGLISH CATHOLIC MISSIONS. By *John Orlebar Payne, M.A.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

We have already had occasion to remark, *appropos* of a former work of Mr. Payne's, of the great awakening of interest in historical matters that has taken place recently both in England and in this country.

We do not wonder at the difficulties encountered by the compiler of this work; but we have good reason to wonder at the rich results of his investigations and researches; for we can realize what an amount of persevering industry was required to unearth and arrange such precious information as he gives. Similar work is in progress for this country, and is being done, if more slowly, at least more thoroughly. We have not such a wide field, historically, if geographically, to work upon as is the England of the era of the penal laws, the records that were kept of Catholics in the British colonies being few and circumscribed; but there is a fair promise that every shred of historical information in existence will in time be placed within reach of every reader. Such a work has long been in progress for Canada, which is exceptionally rich in original historical documents.

MORAL PHILOSOPHY; OR, ETHICS AND NATURAL LAW. By *Rev. John Rickaby, S. J.* Second edition. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

Though the third in the order of reading of the Stonyhurst series of Manuals of Catholic Philosophy, the first edition of this volume was the first to appear. It is a worthy companion to the two volumes that have already been noticed in these pages, possessing all their excellences of style and arrangement of subject matter, which in this case, as Father Rickaby well remarks, "is also a study especially valued by the Catholic Church, the great Guardian of morals, and Teacher of nations. It is a field on which the Society of Jesus has labored, 'through evil report and good report.'" The book is divided into two main sections, the first giving a clear and methodical exposition of Ethics, and the second of Natural Law. From recent events and developments in our country, it is clear that the contents of both sections cannot be mastered too soon by every well-meaning citizen, as there is an alarmingly widespread disregard of the principles of both public and private morals.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Prepared for use in Catholic Schools, Academies and Colleges. By *Francis T. Furey, A. M.* New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

We have been favored with advance sheets of this new work, which is intended to fill a gap that has hitherto existed in the file of Catholic school books. The treatment is by way of question and answer, the former being direct and the latter brief. Not only are all the articles, sections and clauses of the Constitution and its amendments treated in detail, but there are introductory chapters on government in general and its various forms, and a supplement on State and municipal governments. There are also in the volume a review of the Articles of Confederation that preceded our present Constitution, and a historical retrospect explaining the causes that led to both. Particular stress is laid upon the reasons why Catholics should particularly admire American institutions as they now exist. We hope to see this new book adopted generally in Catholic educational establishments.

THE POPE AND IRELAND. Containing newly discovered historical facts concerning the Forged Bulls attributed to Popes Adrian IV. and Alexander III., together with a sketch of the union existing between the Catholic Church and Ireland from the Twelfth to the Nineteenth century. By *Stephen J. McCormick*, Editor of the San Francisco "Monitor." San Francisco, California: A. Waldteufel. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

This book is for the most part a reprint of one side of a newspaper controversy, and as such might have been remodelled with advantage before being put in this permanent form. There is here too much reference to the opponent. But with this reservation, we have nothing but praise to bestow on Mr. McCormick's labors. He has in a most painstaking manner collected all the evidence regarding the point in controversy and made the best use of it. His work, too, is the first successful effort to cover the whole subject and to put all the available material in a permanent form and within the easily accessible reach of all. For this service alone he has laid all Catholics under a lasting obligation to him.

CONSTITUTIONES CATHOLICÆ UNIVERSITATIS AMERICÆ A SANCTA LEDE APPROBATÆ, CUM DOCUMENTIS ANNEXIS. ROMÆ: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide. MDCCCLXXXIX.

This handsome volume contains the Latin text of the documents pertaining to the establishment of our new University at Washington,

namely, the Apostolic Letters of the Holy Father dated April 10, 1887, and March 7, 1889; the Rescript of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda of March 23, 1889; the letters of the trustees of the University and of certain archbishops to the Holy Father, and to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, of October 25, 1886; letters from the same to His Holiness and to the Prefect of Propaganda of November 13, 1888; the General Constitutions of the University and those of the Theological Faculty. In these documents it is clearly set forth how the government of the new institution is provided for.

THE RELIGIOUS STATE. Together with a short treatise on the vocation to the Priesthood. Translated from the Italian of St. Alphonsus de Liguori. Edited by *Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.S.S.R.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

In this little volume, issued separately from the handsome centenary edition of the works of St. Alphonsus, are briefly and clearly set forth, first, the requisite for a vocation to the religious state, and, second, considerations for those who are called to such a condition of life. At the end of the volume there is a special treatment of the vocation to the priesthood. The book should be studied by every person contemplating a life in the religious state.

ST. BASIL'S HYMNAL. Containing music for Vespers of all the Sundays and Festivals of the year, three Masses, and over two hundred Hymns, together with Litanies, Daily Prayers, Prayers at Mass, Preparation and Prayers for Confession and Communion, and the Office and Rules for Sodalties of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Compiled from approved sources. *Permissu Superiorum.* Published at St. Michael's College, Toronto. 1889.

The only reason why its first title is given to this book seems to be that it is published by the Basilian Fathers. It is a useful, convenient and cheap manual for general use, and has been prepared with care and judgment. We are glad to notice that it is provided with a full alphabetical index.

LECTURES ON ENGLISH LITERATURE. By *Maurice Francis Egan, LL.D.* New York: William H. Sadler.

We have collected here a series of addresses made before young ladies of St. Mary's Academy, Notre Dame, Ind., by the Professor of English literature in Notre Dame University. They are, as is naturally to be expected from the occasion calling them forth, rather pleasant chats than profound studies. Considering that they are detached also as to subject, and not a continuous treatise, the title is somewhat misleading.

THE SACRED HEART LIBRARY. A quarterly series of standard theological works. No. 1: The Apostleship of Prayer. By *Father Henry Romière, S.J.* A new Translation, with notes, reference analyses, and index. First part (complete in one number). Philadelphia: Rev. R. S. Dewey, S.J., Publisher (office of the "Messenger of the Sacred Heart"). 1889.

Father Dewey has in this work entered upon an enterprise that deserves to meet with great success. There is no need of a commendation from

us of Father Romière's great work, of which this version by Father Dewey is eminently worthy. It is handsomely printed in a handy form, and sold at a price that places it within everybody's reach.

GOLDEN WORDS; OR, MAXIMS OF THE CROSS. Translated and adapted from the Latin of Thomas à Kempis. By *F. H. Hamilton, M.A.* Fourth edition. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

In recommending this little work we need only quote Cardinal Newman, who qualifies it as "a beautiful little book, beautiful within and beautiful in its appearance," and Canon Oakely, who vouches for it as deserving to be in the hands of all Catholics.

THE HOLY MASS. The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ. The Ceremonies of the Mass. Preparation and Thanksgiving. The Mass and the Office that are hurriedly said. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.S.S.R. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

This is the thirteenth volume of the uniform duodecimo centenary edition of St. Alphonsus' complete works. Its character and contents are sufficiently indicated by the full title given. We think it one of the most interesting and useful of the volumes thus far issued.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE ST. GERTRUDE MANUAL; OR, SPIRIT OF DEVOTION. Selected for the most part from the Revelations of Sts. Gertrude and Mechtildis. Containing also a very useful and consoling instruction on Prayer; on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; on Holy Communion; also a Preparation for Death. Second revised edition. Fr. Pustet & Co.: New York and Cincinnati. 1889.

THE ROMAN HYMNAL. A complete Manual of English Hymns and Latin Chants for the use of congregations, schools, colleges and choirs. Compiled and arranged by *Rev. J. B. Young, S.J.*, choir-master of St. Francis Xavier's Church. New York. Fifth edition. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.

CAMPION: A Tragedy, in a Prologue and Four Acts. By *The Reverend G. Longhaye, S.J.* Translated into English blank verse by James Gillow Morgan. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

THE CASTLE AND THE MANOR; OR, MY HERO AND HIS FRIENDS. A story. By *M. A. De Winter*, of Rome. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co.

CORRECTIONS.—Two errors occur in the article by Rev. W. A. Fletcher in the issue of last April. On page 358, towards the end of the second paragraph, the word "unified" should be substituted for "verified;" and on page 363, in the second member of the sentence beginning, "Therefore practical reason," the text should read, "and if morality be *subjective*," etc., not "objective."

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—OCTOBER, 1889.—No. 56.

THE STRUGGLE FOR CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS IN FRANCE.

“**I**N primary schools, the influence of religion must be habitually present: If the priest distrusts the teacher, or leaves him alone, or if the teacher looks upon himself as the independent rival, and not the faithful fellow-worker of the priest, the moral value of the school is lost, and it is not far from becoming a danger.”

So speaks, in his “Memoirs,” the illustrious Guizot, the greatest Protestant produced by France in modern times.

Now listen to M. Jules Ferry, the man who plumes himself on being the author of the present system of national education in France, which he has made, so far as the law can make it, compulsory and absolutely GODLESS:

“The scholar system of the Republic is not the work of any one particular person or party; it is the product of our Republican party as a whole. It is a living witness of what can be effected by unanimity and perseverance in a party thoroughly united.

“It is not an edifice merely begun; nor is it as yet completed. Nothing can ever be said to be finished in the matter of public instruction. It is not a structure the foundations of which are merely traced out on the ground. It stands erect before us; and we can survey its design and understand its harmony. . . . I say with pride, in the name of the whole Democratic party, this is the system dreamed of by the immortal authors of this great, complete

plan of (lay and godless) instruction, reported to the legislature by Talleyrand and elaborated by Condorcet.

"Yes, this system of national education, dreamed of by our fathers, is now a reality.

"We reproach the Revolution (of 1789) with having betrayed many hopes. History has, indeed, recorded more than one striking failure. But here the success is complete."

So spoke Gambetta's right-hand man and successor in the French Chamber of Deputies, on the 6th of June last. It was a memorable and stormy session. So long as the ex-minister confined himself to a history and defence of the process of *laicization* and *dechristianization* (for this term is now adopted) of the public schools and other institutions in France, he was cheered by his own—the Centre—party, and by the Radical Left. But this arch-persecutor, who had driven thousands of saintly religious from their homes, and spent hundreds upon hundreds of millions in erecting schools from which God is banished, had the effrontery to conclude his discourse by offering to Catholics proposals of religious peace. Then arose such a storm of indignation as never before raged within the chamber,—the Catholics repelling with scorn and defiance the peace offered by such hands, and the Radical Left denouncing with cries of fury the false-hearted hypocrite who dared to speak in their name or offer any truce to the Catholic Church.

Then came the sitting of June the 8th, when Count Albert de Mun, speaking in the name of Christian France, replied to Ferry. Never did the French Chambers behold such a triumph of Christian eloquence and patriotism over the cause of the anti-Christian revolution.

Ferry had been foolhardy enough to quote in favor of his lay schools and godless system of instruction the great authority of Guizot. The excitement and enthusiasm of the Chamber reached its height when Count de Mun, after refuting the statistics of his adversary, turned against him the well-known religious sentiments and declarations of the great Calvinist prime minister.

"Ah, you try to throw the great name of Guizot like a mantle over your hideous deeds!" he exclaimed. "No, no! Guizot is not with you, nor Saint-Marc Girardin, nor Victor Hugo. . . . Oh, no, no! You must not cover yourself with these great names. The memory of these illustrious dead rises up against you. You do not belong to their family; you have no right to call upon them. If you really need some one to father you, then claim Danton. He shouted out in the Convention these blasphemous words: 'I belong to the republic before they belong to their party.'"

Here the Extreme or Radical Left broke forth in

plause of Danton's sentiment, while the Conservative members were carried beyond themselves by the victorious eloquence of the speaker.

"Ah," said Count de Mun, turning toward the Left, "you are right in cheering these words; I know you thereby. In so far as Danton is concerned, you belong to his family." There was an indescribable outburst of cheering on the one side, and of mad, angry cries on the other. "Our children belong to France," shouted one, "before they belong to the Vatican!" But the entire assemblage was under the mighty spell of the Christian orator, and every interruption only drew down on the Republican majority some crushing rejoinder which silenced and stunned them.

"Yes," he said, with a superb gesture of scorn and defiance, "your ancestors are to be found in the Convention. Nowhere else must you seek them. From them you learned that educational *neutrality*, which you, M. Jules Ferry, dared the other day to defend here to our faces,—aye, to *our* faces, who know what is happening in every one of our departments. . . ."

So far, we are like one reporting from the battle-field the progress of some mighty conflict,—like Chickamauga, or Chancellorsville, or Gettysburg,—on the issue of which hangs the life of a nation.

Aye,—on the conflict now going on in France depends, in very, very deed, the life of the nation. And if the greatness, the very existence, of France is involved in the present struggle, surely the issue must be not only interesting to all Christendom, in which this noble people have played hitherto a leading part, but to Americans all that touches the life of France must be a matter of deep and loving interest. For her soldiers stood by ours beneath the stars and stripes, when our independence as a nation was won. And her peril as a nation, as a Catholic nation especially, must be to all Irishmen and descendants of Irishmen a subject of still deeper concern. For in the days when our ancestral faith was sorely persecuted, and the very existence of the Irish race was threatened, we found in Catholic France both warm sympathy and effective succor.

It will, therefore, most surely interest us now to study well the chances in favor of the sorely tried cause of Christian education in that same France. All the other questions raised by the present anti-Christian persecutors,—the suppression of the Budget of Public Worship and of the Embassy to the Vatican, the repeal of the Concordat, the complete separation of Church and State, the taking away from the clergy of cathedrals, churches, episcopal

residences, and presbyteries,—all these are secondary to the one great vital question :

Will the youth of France be educated henceforth in godless, anti-Christian schools? Or, will the great majority of the nation succeed in educating their children in the knowledge and practice of their ancestral faith?

We take it that the very existence of France as a nation depends on its remaining a Christian nation.

By carefully analyzing the discussion that has just ended in the French legislature, we shall be able to obtain a correct estimate of the real success achieved so far by the anti-Christian Republican majority in the Chambers, as represented by M. Jules Ferry, as well as of the heroic efforts and sacrifices made by the real majority of the French people, under the leadership of Count de Mun and Senator Chesnelong,—to educate the youth of France in Christian principles, and to keep its manhood on the royal road of Christian practice.

I.

Ere we come to examine M. Jules Ferry's utterances on June 6th, 1889, it will be instructive to give a brief history of his calamitous achievements as Minister of Public Instruction and Prime Minister.

The readers of the REVIEW will not have forgotten the lamentable want of moral courage shown in January, 1879, by Marshal MacMahon, when he allowed the intrigues and votes of the Republican majority in the French chambers to frighten him into abdicating the presidency. The veteran soldier should have stood to his post of duty without any thought of surrendering to a factious opposition.

Jules Grevy, chosen to succeed him by the majority of both Chambers united, was only a figurehead, Gambetta, the speaker of the Chamber of Deputies, being the real ruler of France. But his rule only lasted so long as he carried out the behests of the Masonic and anti-Christian power which controlled Parliament, and was aiming to be absolute and unchecked master of the military, educational, and administrative forces of France.

The first advantage which the lodges determined to obtain was to possess themselves of the schools of the nation, and to banish from them every master or mistress who believed in God or was likely to inculcate religious belief or practice.

In 1875, a law had authorized the creation of Catholic universities in Paris, Lille, Tours, Lyons, and Toulouse. These were erected and organized by private subscriptions amounting to three millions of dollars, one proof among many of the exhaustless

generosity of French Catholics. And this first subscription was only the beginning of the magnanimous support to be given to these great schools.

But the repeal of this law, and the abrogation of every disposition known to exist in favor of Catholic or religious instruction in French legislation, was made by the government a question of immediate urgency. Of course the Masonic press, all powerful for evil at the moment, cheered on the legislature in its work of destruction.

Jules Ferry, the Minister of Public Instruction, introduced a Bill, on March 15th, 1879, for organizing on a new footing the Superior Council of Public Instruction. Up to that time four seats had been reserved in that body for the representatives of the French Hierarchy. The new Bill eliminated from it almost every religious element and influence. The "free" or unofficial establishments of superior education in France were allowed, indeed, to have *four* members to represent them; but the remaining *fifty* members of the council were carefully selected because they were heart and soul in favor of LAICIZATION, that is, of taking the instruction and training of youth entirely out of the hands of the Church, or of any person or persons known to be or suspected of being tainted with "clericalism," that is, attachment to the ancient religion of France.

Against this outrageous invasion of the most sacred rights of the nation, such men as the extremely liberal Jules Simon and the Protestant Laboulaye raised their voices in indignant remonstrance. It was all in vain.

A second Bill deprived the great Catholic schools of the title of universities, and forbade their professors to fulfil the office of examiners for academical degrees. The matriculation fees which, in accordance with the former law, were exacted by the Catholic universities, were now done away with; and a heavy fee was demanded of all their pupils who presented themselves before the State examiners.

Under the second republic, in 1850, and while Louis Napoleon was President, Count de Falloux, then Minister of Public Instruction, had a law passed authorizing the religious orders of men and women to found schools all over France. These, as distinguished from the great Government university, its network of colleges and academies, and the tens of thousands of primary schools paid for by the State,—were called "*Écoles Libres*" or Free Schools. In 1879 the latter educated 71,000 pupils, while the total number of pupils in the State schools only amounted to 70,000.

This success of free Catholic education was the one thing which

the anti-Christian conspirators determined to get rid of without delay in 1879.

Here comes in what is known as the *Seventh Article* in the second of M. Jules Ferry's twin bills. This article excluded from teaching in any school, public or private, persons belonging to any religious congregation or order not authorized by the existing laws of France. This article, therefore, removed from their position as teachers or directors all the religious bodies in charge of colleges or establishments of secondary education, as well as the immense majority of masters and mistresses in the Catholic primary schools.

The Christian Brothers, the Lazarists, the Fathers and Brothers of the Holy Cross, and a few others officially recognized by the Government, escaped proscription for the moment,—but, after all, only for the moment.

In both of the French Chambers illustrious jurists and statesmen demonstrated in vain the iniquity and illegality of M. Ferry's proposed measure. It was a violation of international law,—for there existed in France a Concordat with the Holy See, and this *Seventh Article* violated its most important stipulations. It violated the natural law, since it trampled on the most sacred rights of parents. It was, they contended, an infraction of French constitutional and common law, since it made an illegal discrimination against one class of citizens, whom it arbitrarily deprived of the rights guaranteed to all without distinction.

But the Religious Order particularly aimed at by this odious class legislation and proscription was the Jesuits. Their schools in France were numerous and most successful, although deprived of all Government patronage, of all support from the public treasury. Their professional schools in Paris and in Metz were rapidly filling with their pupils the polytechnic schools, the military and naval academies, and the central schools of arts and manufactures. Their colleges sent constantly increasing numbers of candidates to the annual State examinations. They were outstripping, overshadowing the University,—the great nursery of skepticism. This was not to be tolerated.

The first of M. Ferry's bills passed the Senate on January 30th, 1880, and at once became a law. The second bill,—the hateful *Seventh Article* especially, was twice rejected, on March the 9th and 15th following.

Thereupon the Prime Minister, De Freycinet (the present Minister of War), besought the senators to reconsider their vote, assuring them that the *Seventh Article* would only be applied to the Jesuits, and that their refusal to pass the bill would only call for a more general and rigorous application of the existing laws.

Just as this second bill was again laid before the Senate, on

March 16th, and without the *Seventh Article*, a member of the House of Deputies moved a resolution, passed by a vote of 338 against 147, peremptorily calling on the Government to apply immediately the existing laws to all non-authorized religious orders and congregations.

This stratagem or comedy was well devised, and succeeded in its purpose. It dispensed the government from waiting for the formal enactment of the *Seventh Article*, throwing over the measures it at once adopted a thin covering of parliamentary authority.

"Existing laws" might mean laws covering a period of hundreds of years, forgotten by all save by the bad men who wish to call them up from the dead past to justify the political crimes of the present. The best legal minds, the highest judicial authorities in France, protested against the second Bill and the *Seventh Article* in particular.

But MM. de Freycinet and Ferry only wanted the flimsiest of pretexts for the revolutionary action they contemplated.

On May 29th the law suppressing the Catholic universities was promulgated. And simultaneously two presidential decrees appeared, one directed against the Society of Jesus by name, the other against all unauthorized congregations.

The Government had set its spies to work, while parliament and the press were passionately discussing these measures of proscription; and the statistics, incorrect, garbled, exaggerated, or correct only in some few particulars, were given to the most influential journals, serving as ready materials for inflammatory denunciation and appeals to the worst passions in the human breast.

It was announced in the Chamber of Deputies that there existed in France fifty religious orders or monastic associations of men not authorized by law, with 8000 members living in 400 houses. Of this total membership the Jesuits counted 1500, the Trappists 1400, the Capuchins 500, and so on.

The association of religious women had a membership of 14,000, with 1000 establishments; 6000 of these women were "not authorized" by law, and were occupied in educating little children of their own sex; 3000 tended the sick; 1000 were in charge of orphanages; 2000 were devoted to a life of solitude and prayer.

On June 30th of that ill-starred year 1880, the Jesuit residences in Paris and the provinces were entered by force, and the inmates driven forth from their poor, bare rooms into the streets amid the protestations, the indignant cries, the mingled blessings and tears of the Catholics,—and to the great joy of the wretched rabble minority of the spectators, who jeered and insulted.

The Jesuit colleges were given a few weeks' delay. But their turn came in August.

Then occurred in the capital of France, and in almost every one of its great cities, examples of magnanimity and self-sacrifice on the part of the French judiciary and magistracy, unparalleled in the history of any known country. By November, 1880, no less than 382 magistrates had left their places on the bench rather than sanction the enormous iniquity of the Freycinet-Ferry proscriptions, rather than wound their conscience, or stain their ermine, by seeming to acquiesce in the sacrilegious wrong perpetrated by the persecutors. Two hundred and sixty-three other magistrates had, at the same date, been removed by the Government for resisting the arbitrary and illegal proceedings of the minister.

This justice must be done to M. de Freycinet, that after having let loose the torrent of anti-Christian hatred and violence against these thousands of devoted men and women, who could not or would not defend themselves against the unspeakable brutality with which they were expelled from their homes,—he endeavored to effect a compromise with the Holy See.

He drew up, or caused to be drawn up, a declaration to be signed by the superiors of all religious orders and establishments, pledging themselves, in substance, to refrain from all interference in politics, while obeying the constituted authorities.

The Pope was induced to advise the acceptance of this compromise, in order to avoid further measures of proscription. But Freycinet overrated his own influence over his colleagues, over the Chambers, over the Masonic conspirators behind the Chambers. He was kicked contumeliously aside by the irreligious majority; and was succeeded by Ferry, who had as Minister of the Interior the M. Constans who, at this writing, occupies the same position, and for Minister of Public Instruction M. Paul Bert—all three destined to live eternally in the memory of French Catholics.

So the flood of persecution, which had paused a moment as before a sudden obstacle, now rushed onward more furiously than ever, sweeping out of existence the holy abodes of learning, of charity, of prayerful piety and contemplation which the first rush of waters had not destroyed.

Then occurred scenes which recalled the suppression and sack of the English monasteries under the eighth Henry. Happily the *Triumvirs* who ruled France in 1830 did not care to dip their hands in blood.

But we must not forget that, in all this, they were only preparing the way for the execution of their ultimate design—that of *laicizing* or *dechristianizing* all the schools of France.

We have omitted to mention the noble resistance opposed to all these measures by Cardinal Guibert, Archbishop of Paris, and his brother bishops, as well as the unavailing efforts of the Pope and

of the Nuncio in Paris to protect the men and women who were the glory of France and the very flower of Christian manhood and womanhood.

Nor must we allow ourselves to think that the French Catholic Conservatives in the French Chambers and outside of them were silent or passive, while the persecutor was abroad profaning, wasting, destroying the holy places of the kingdom of St. Louis. That band of unconquerable patriots and defenders of their ancestral faith, Count Albert de Mun, Lucien Brun, Chesnelong, Bernard, Keller, Barons de Ravignan, de la Bassetierre, and de Mackau, formed a defensive league, into which came the most honored names and the highest abilities of Catholic France. They instituted a permanent committee of inquiry, composed of the leading Conservatives in both houses of the legislature, who watched and denounced, with unslumbering vigilance and fearless courage, every act of violence and outrage committed by the Government or its officials against the rights and liberties of Catholics.

These are the men who planted high above the level of party politics and paltry passions the banner of the new crusade they have undertaken in favor of the freedom of the Church, of Catholic education, of the elevation of the working classes, of the preservation of French manhood and youth from the taint of the prevailing unbelief and moral corruption.

What Count de Mun and Senator Chesnelong have achieved in this glorious cause it would be pleasant to tell. But we shall have to say something of their priceless services before the end of this article.

As is well known, MM. Ferry, Paul Bert, and Constans did not pause in their career of oppression. Nor could they pause even if they would. The Masonic power, whose willing instruments they were, pushed them onward to enact a worse law after a bad one. The chaplaincies were suppressed in the army and navy; they were soon to disappear in every State institution of education and charity, as well as in the prisons. The public hospitals were to be taken away from the sisterhoods that had served them with such heroic and uniform devotedness as to make their services the theme of enthusiastic praise even from Protestants. Cemeteries consecrated exclusively to the burial of Catholics were, perforce, thrown open to all without distinction.

Nay, what never until then had been heard of, a network of associations covered all France, the members of which were solemnly pledged—and the pledge witnessed and subscribed—not to ask for or accept the services of any minister of religion in sickness, at the hour of death; not to permit the rites of Christian

burial to be performed either in their own behalf or in behalf of their dependents.

More than that : special organs in the press were established in every province of France, whose main duty it was to watch over the faithful execution of the rules of this satanic association, and to spread its principles through all classes of French society. We have seen in Paris and its neighborhood, within the last two years, more than one instance where men so pledged found means, in their latest hours, to baffle the vigilance of their anti-Christian associates, to secure the services of a priest and to receive the last sacraments of the Church. But it was in vain that the family of the deceased sought to have the rites of Christian burial performed. The society produced their deceased member's pledge ; obtained for its fulfilment the support of the authorities, and carried off the corpse to an unblest grave.

On December 31st, 1882, Léon Gambetta died of a wound inflicted a month previously by the hand of a woman. It was said, we know not if on good authority, that the ex-Dictator of France had been condemned by the lodges to die,—because, having it in his power to set aside the Concordat, to make an end of the Catholic Church in France, to push persecution to its extreme limits,—he had not dared to go far enough in the evil way. It was said also that, during his long agony, he, like Victor Hugo, asked for a priest, but that none would be permitted to approach him.

Be that as it may, the man who had given to the anti-Christian revolution the watchword, *le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi !* (priestcraft is your enemy!), had for the unfaltering executors of his will and programme Jules Ferry and Paul Bert.

These, and the parliament which legislated for Antichrist, had done their best to annihilate superior Catholic education. But the Catholic universities, though shorn of their title, and deprived of all legal recognition or encouragement from the State, continued none the less to do their divine work ; and the Catholics of France continued most generously to support them.

The most important, the all-important advantage to be gained by the men in power, was the absolute and exclusive control of the elementary schools of France. The young generations were to be, from the cradle, moulded in conformity with the principles of unbelief. The first step, after *laicizing* the primary schools, and banishing from them all religious teachers, was to impose such manuals on masters and pupils as would effectually impregnate mind and heart with anti-Christian notions and sentiments.

Thereupon M. Paul Bert, the Minister of Public Instruction and Public Worship (!), drew up, or caused to be drawn up, under his own special care, a *Manuel Civique*, in which it is openly affirmed

that any conception of a Deity is impossible to the human intellect; that the supernatural order is essentially opposed to progress; that religion is only a superstition devised by priests for their own benefit; that every individual has an inherent right to openly profess atheism, etc.

This catechism of impiety was, forthwith, officially imposed on all state primary schools as a manual.

Condemned at once by the Congregation of the Index, the French bishops courageously forbade its use. The government retaliated by punishing these daring prelates, as well as the priests who had obeyed them. Within a few days some 400 rectors of parishes, guilty of such an offence against M. Paul Bert's doctrinal omnipotence, had their salaries withdrawn. All children in the State schools who refused to accept the manual were expelled, and soon afterwards their parents were fined for violating the law which made the attendance of their children obligatory.

We have said that the Christian Brothers were not involved in the suppression decreed against the Jesuits and other "unauthorized congregations." Besides, it had been a recognized principle, both in French law and in the civil administration, that to each commune (or township) in France belonged the duty to build and maintain its primary schools, and the right to select the teachers thereof. The communes, therefore, for the most part, protected the Brothers in the performance of their holy work.

But the *laicizing* majority in the legislature was determined to make an end of this by depriving the communes of France of this sacred right, and by giving the State supreme and exclusive control over all the primary schools—buildings, teachers and expenditure. So, in 1882 and again on October 28th, 1886, by a vote of 361 against 172, this educational revolution was completed, and it was forbidden to all members of religious communities thereafter to teach in any public primary school. Six months were allowed for the carrying out in its completeness of this great work of *laicizing* the schools of France.

Such, in brief, is the history of this momentous change effected in the midst of a great Christian nation by a bold, daring, unscrupulous, but compact minority, who, although distracted and divided among themselves, had one object about which they acted as a unit—that is, the destruction in France of Christianity.

The discourse delivered by M. Jules Ferry on June 6th last will supply whatever was purposely omitted in the foregoing narrative.

II.

One feature of M. Ferry's oration was the stunning effrontery with which he produced statistics, the truth of which is contra-

dicted by the most eminent men of the Republican majority, without mentioning the no less eminent statisticians and statesmen among the Conservatives. This audaciousness in affirming that black is white and white black was still more startlingly illustrated when, in the last part of his discourse, he not only denied that in all the process of *laicization*, going on for ten years, there was anything savoring of religious persecution; but—and this capped the climax—that it was “the clericals” who were, or threatened to be, the persecutors!

He did not attempt to apologize for the enormous and useless expense incurred by the Government in constructing all over France a system of magnificent primary school edifices, in order to offset the local Catholic schools, and to make the new structures outwardly attractive to children and parents. They remind us forcibly of the government model schools built in Ireland as snares for Catholic pupil teachers, or of the handsome, well-appointed national schools put up in many poor districts of Ireland, where the free Catholic school by its side was only a thatched hovel, or at best a naked barn. But beneath the thatch and in the naked barn the priest was free to come and go when he pleased, to teach catechism, to question the children on the doctrines and practices of their faith; and in the poorest shell of a school-room the teacher was free to have the crucifix hung up on the wall along with the image of the Virgin Mother and her Babe. These had not to be taken down hurriedly and hidden away like something shameful when the school inspector appeared.

How M. Jules Ferry and his subordinates treated the image of Christ crucified and of His Blessed Mother we know too well. This the arch-persecutor found it prudent not to mention. But he will be reminded of it by Count de Mun. Of the sums expended in constructing his lay or anti-Christian schools we can form an estimate from his own words:

“At the end of 1888,” he says, “we had built 19,044 new school-houses; we had refurnished, enlarged or repaired 8288 others—altogether 27,332. There remain to be built, furnished, enlarged or repaired some 6000 school edifices. How much did all this cost us? The total expense, to December 31st, 1888, was 563,000,000 francs (\$112,600,000).”

The real total, according to M. Amagat, a Liberal member of the Chamber of Deputies, is nearer to \$200,000,000 than to \$112,000,000; and this figure is indicated as the only reliable one by other Liberal or Republican scientists. Add to this enormous sum, in a country where the other Government expenditure is yearly increasing at a fearful rate, the incredible sums lavished annually on *laicizing* the hospitals, etc., and one may see that France is paying

dear for the pleasure of creating a national system of atheistical instruction, and of banishing the Sisters of Charity from hospital, orphanage and prison.

"If we hold on to the *lay* school, the *neutral* or undenominational school, as the bulwark of all the liberties so dearly bought and won by our fathers," M. Ferry goes on to say, "our reasons for this attachment are no metaphysical reasons; this change is forced upon us by the historical evolution of French society. . . . The present situation is one which history has made for us. It has its regrettable side, for the divisions it gives rise to rather weaken than strengthen our great country."

"Who is the author of these divisions?" here exclaimed a member of the Right. "Is it not you?"

"There is," continued M. Ferry, "between civil society and religious society a divergency deep and impossible of decrease. For civil society and the power which represents and directs it, the first and the most precious of all goods is freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, freedom to acquire knowledge. For the Catholic Church, on the contrary, the depositary of a truth which she holds to be absolute and eternal, this three-fold liberty is in every way damnable." (Great applause from the Left.)

A member of the Right: "You know very well that this is not as you say."

"Gentlemen," continued M. Ferry, "this question about our schools has been discussed for the last fifty years, and is still deeply agitating our country. It is a culminating point to which we are forced to come: To whom belongs of right the direction of the popular schools? Is it to the Church or to the State?"

"The State is lay," he went on, appropriating to his argument the garbled language and imperfect thought of Guizot, "and the State must retain its lay character for the sake of all the liberties which we have won. The independence and sovereignty of the State is the first principle of our public law. It is a principle which we are necessarily forced to protect and maintain—this general secularization of powers, this lay character of the State.

"Hence it is that we can only intrust to a lay civil power the superintendence of popular schools, and that we hold it to be an article of the faith professed by Democrats that these schools should be neutral, uncontrolled by any religious denomination.

"So we remain profoundly attached to this lay system of schools. Nevertheless, as I have said on more than one occasion, I do not hesitate to declare here in this assembly that *we are anxious to see religious peace reigning throughout our country.*"

These last words let loose the whirlwind.

But M. Ferry was not to be balked in his purpose. He thought,

and probably believed, that the majority thought with him; that, having both education and religion completely at their mercy, Republicans ought to hold out the white flag to the vanquished. And this appeared to be good policy on the eve of a general election. He therefore went on to declare in favor of maintaining the Concordat and not suppressing the Budget of Public Worship.

This gave mortal offence to the Radical Left.

But he went further, and undertook to prove that there existed, ever since 1882, perfect religious freedom in the State schools as *laicized* by him. More even than that: he affirmed again and again that during the five years he had been Minister of Public Instruction not a single remonstrance ever reached him with regard to any act of persecution, intolerance, or interference on the part of his teachers or officials toward their Catholic pupils. He challenged his opponents to say where, or on what occasion, they had ever protested in parliament against such acts of persecution or annoyance.

"We have never missed an occasion of doing so," exclaimed the indignant Count de Mun. "We have protested always and everywhere," said in his turn Baron Reille.

"You never did!" rejoined the unblushing Ferry. "You never once did it, because such abuses were never known to exist, because the law—which you call 'the villainous law' (*la loi scélérate*)—is carried out by the University, by the Ministry of Public Instruction, in a spirit of the greatest toleration."

This will give the reader some faint notion of what M. Jules Ferry is, and of his ideal of religious freedom and toleration. Let us now hear what Count Albert de Mun has to say in reply.

III.

It was in truth a glorious opportunity for the great Catholic orator, the man who represents in his person and his life all that is most noble in the France of St. Louis, to vindicate the cause of religion, right, and justice so long oppressed by the allied sects in whose name M. Ferry had presumed to speak.

He confined himself, in the first part of his discourse, to a triumphant refutation of all the statistics of M. Ferry, establishing the success of the anti-Christian crusade against the primary schools of France. He takes as his authorities the statistical reports of four Republicans and anti-Catholic members of parliament, Senator Boulanger, Antonin Dubost, Léon Say, and M. Combes, together with the tabulated statements of the Government superintendent of primary schools. Having thoroughly mastered and arrayed his figures, the Catholic orator attacked, one after the other, every conclusion of his antagonist.

"I believe," he said, in terminating this first part of his oration, "that your statistics are wrong, that the progress of instruction has been constant in our country during a great number of years. Is it to your compulsory laws that this progress is due? No! And I find the proof of this in your official tables. . . . Only, and I leave you to meditate on this fact,—since the application of the compulsory law the progression has been much greater in the free schools taught by religious congregations than in your public 'lay schools.'" And he gives the figures of the official government reports.

"But have you, after all, been sustained in your work," he asks, "by the kind wishes and urgent solicitations of the people, by the constant sympathy and favor of public opinion?"

"We have! we have!" shout the Radical Left.

"You say you have?" rejoins the orator. "Well, I have only two figures to show you, and you will see that you have not. Your public schools numbered in 1884 to 1885, 3,732,143 pupils; in 1885 to 1886, you only had 3,712,754. In a single season you lost 20,000 pupils. . . .

"It is with us that public opinion sides. Here are the figures of the last statistical tables: Our free schools in 1876 counted 440,000 pupils; in 1885 to 1886, they numbered 836,691 pupils. In ten years we doubled the number of our scholars. And in the year that you lost 20,000, we had an increase of 6000.

"This result has been obtained, not by burdening the taxpayers with new charges, but by asking voluntary sacrifices and contributions from all those who have a care of the freedom of their souls and of the souls of their children.

"I can tell you that in the single city of Paris our free (Catholic) schools have cost us 17,000,000 francs (\$3,400,000), and that they demand of us 2,000,000 more every year for their support; all this we take from our own pockets. When free-thinkers and atheists will have done as much, they will have a right to shout victory."

Then come the magnificent passages which we quoted from Count de Mun's discourse at the beginning of this article. M. Ferry had challenged the right to produce a single instance of outrage or persecution against religion committed in the State primary schools. M. René Goblet, who had just been a member of the Floquet ministry, interrupted Count de Mun to repeat this challenge: "Give us facts!" he shouted.

"You dare to speak thus before us," De Mun replied, turning on Ferry, "before us who know what things are said in your schools; before us who know the lessons dictated to the pupils under pretence of being patriotic themes, but which your scholars are compelled to write in order that they may thereby learn to

hold in contempt the beliefs they had hitherto cherished; before us who have beheld the profanation of religious emblems,—like the crucifix of Benon in the Gironde, broken to pieces and cast into a cesspool! And then that wayside crucifix in a commune of Eure-et-Loir, shattered by musket balls fired at it by a school-master.

"Ah, you challenge me to produce facts; here are a few more!" And he goes on to recite other instances of horrible profanation and brutal impiety: "These are facts of daily occurrence," he says, "the public press is full of them, and you say that we allege nothing that is precise and specific."

"But," replies poor whipped Ferry, "there have been since my time three Ministers of Public Instruction, and you have questioned none of them on these occurrences?"

The great orator needs push that matter no further; he is impatient to reply to the hypocritical offer of peace which his adversary had made on the 6th.

"You ended your discourse, Monsieur Jules Ferry," he said, "by speaking of a religious pacification. YOU!"

"And it is on the strength of this scholastic achievement, so little needed for the progress of instruction, so disastrous to our finances,—a work which inflicts a direct wound on the freedom of our consciences and our families, and whose sole object must be to *de-christianize*, legally and systematically, this country; it is leaning on this work, as on a pedestal, that you come here,—you, Monsieur Jules Ferry, to stand before France as the representative of a government able to bestow on us religious peace!

"Well, you must tell us, before we proceed any further, on what grounds is to repose the peace you propose, and what surety you can offer us for its conclusion. It is not with the assurance of your repentance. You feel none."

"None!"

"Of course not. You are determined not to repent. For when, lately in the Senate, one of the most eloquent men of your party, one of your former associates, M. Challemel-Lacour, condemned severely, in a very fine discourse, the policy pursued during the last six years, instead of assenting to his opinion, you seized the first public occasion offered you by your friends to declare that, prouder than emperors or their great ministers, you would never go to Canossa! In proposing, in devising this religious pacification, you were, you said, resolved that it should not be purchased by a single regretful word uttered by you. And two days ago, in your discourse, you made certain declarations, but not a word was said in extenuation of your evil deeds. More than that, you gloried in them!

"Tell me, then, I pray you, on what reposes this religious peace you offer us? Is it on your political past?"

"But, then, *you must have forgotten everything?*"

And here there was a storm of cheering. It was such a dramatic scene as had not been witnessed in the French Chambers since the time of Berryer. The Catholic orator had represented Ferry as placed before the country on his own evil deeds as on a pedestal,—and there he subjected the culprit to such a flagellation as few ever before received in public.

"And that infamous Seventh Article," he went on, while Ferry cowered, winced, and grew livid by turns, "that Seventh Article invented for the purposes of the Radicalism you then professed, inserted, like an unexpected provocation, in a law that you called by irony a law on the freedom of superior instruction; and all that campaign of violent and passionate accusation, begun here in this tribune by you and your friends, and continued throughout France, not alone against the Jesuits, but against religion itself, by assailing its hierarchy, its worship, its ministers,—reserving to yourself, as M. Lamy said to you, *to respect all the rest*. . . . (Bursts of laughter and applause); that campaign in which, in order to get rid of a few religious men whose presence troubled you, you trampled under foot the freedom of association, individual freedom, freedom of thought, in spite of the protestations of the old Liberals belonging to your party,—of M. Dufaure, of Jules Simon; in spite of the legal advice of the most eminent lawyers in the land, of M. Rousse and M. Demolombe; in spite of the remonstrances poured in upon you and covered with 1,800,000 signatures."

Another outburst of cheering.

"And you have forgotten all that!"

"You have forgotten the decrees of March 29th, which weigh down your name with a load of infamy you can never shake off (another irrepressible burst of applause), issued at that time when, beaten in the legal battle by the revolt of men's consciences and the resistance of the liberal-minded, you came here to make the Radical party give you orders to. . . . Ah, I behold it still, that never-to-be-forgotten sitting; I still hear M. Madier de Montjau order you to bring back here to them the spoils of the religious orders. And then you began throughout the country a series of sieges of a novel nature, picking up for your offensive armor the rusty weapons of by-gone despotism. You burst in by brute force the doors which protected individual liberty and the personal inviolability of the citizen,—to cast forth on the street unoffending priests escorted by the public veneration, and obliging the soldiers of France to assist at these brutalities as if to cover them by their respected presence! (Enthusiastic cheering). . . .

"You have forgotten all this; and you were speaking here in front of the ministerial benches, on which the executor of these decrees has reappeared, like a living accusation; you were speaking of religious peace! And M. Constans is now a minister, and you are covering him with your protection!" (Prolonged and repeated cheering.)

The Chamber was utterly carried away by this flood of just and terrible invective.

"Am I to rehearse here for your benefit the whole of your history?" he exclaims. "Must I remind you of the crucifixes of the Parisian schools broken to pieces to inaugurate your new lessons, . . . broken up by the prefect, M. Herold, before the eyes of the pupils, and then tumbled into carts to be carried away? And these laicizations so brutally effected, even before the law had been voted; the members of brotherhoods and sisterhoods thrust out of their homes, in spite of all the memories of our late war; aye, in spite of the Brothers, at Champigny, gathering up the wounded from the deep snow while the shells were bursting around them; and in spite of the Sisters of Charity dying by the side of our sick in the ambulances?"

"You were in the Senate when that fatal law of the 28th of March was voted . . . ; when Catholics and Liberals united their efforts to save from your hands some remnant of the independence of souls, of the freedom of families, of spiritual morality,—endeavoring to save before all Christian instruction, then the notions relating to our duties toward God,—while you caused every amendment to be voted down pitilessly, until a man rose—the chairman of the committee—and exclaimed: 'I vote against these amendments, because I am an Atheist.'

"You were sitting on the ministerial bench, on that same bench from which Victor Cousin started up, indignant, when some one dared to accuse the University of teaching impiety. But you sat there; you said no word; you only bent your head!" (Renewed cheering.)

"And this is the way that what you call *neutrality* has taken possession of the law. And you have the audacity to pronounce the word in our presence!

"This is your past. Well, then, I must tell it to you candidly: If you forget, we do not, and never will forget!" (Exclamations and shouts of "No, never!")

Surely no statesman ever received such a castigation. There was another count in this terrible arraignment, which had to be brought home to M. Jules Ferry.

"You must be told it," Count de Mun went on to say, "no matter how hard the truth may be, there are, in our country, thousands

of Christian homes in which your name is mentioned only with tears.

"There are thousands of families of workingmen, of petty functionaries especially, who, having no free school near at hand, or because the father would lose his place if he were to send his child to a Christian school, are obliged to sacrifice their little ones to the lay school, the Godless school. Mothers weep over the bitter necessity, and they know it is you who created it!

"You must also know that there are men in France,—I am one of them, and I therefore speak of it with emotion,—men who may not give their sons the education they had planned for them, under masters of their own choosing, in the doctrines and principles they would have their dear ones inherit, and who are obliged to ask of the generous hospitality of a neighboring country the freedom which you refuse them.

"When, three or four times a year, one has to leave one's children over there, in exile, and as they are shown, from the cliffs of Dover, through the fog, that land of France for which they are told daily they are bound to give their whole strength and the last drop of blood"—The storm of applause broke forth anew before the speaker could end his sentence. The Radical M. Lyonnais thought to end it for him by calling out: "You fill them with hatred of France!" But the Christian parent and patriot heeded him not, and continued:

"What answer can you make when they ask you why they do not grow up to manhood in their native land, if it be not to pronounce your name?"

The Right again applauded frantically; for all were under the spell of the deep emotion of the speaker.

"These are the things which you ought to know," he went on; "when a politician, a statesman, has in the past incurred such responsibilities, he should not speak of pacification, or he should speak of it in the name of his deep sorrow."

Deep as must have been the humiliation of M. Ferry, his punishment was not yet ended. Count de Mun, next recalling the splendid opportunity had, in 1879 and 1880, as well as in the two following years, for appeasing the passions of political parties, described the criminal use he had made of the opportunity.

"Then it was you could speak of appeasement," he said, "you and the men of the moderate party. You had not then heaped up all the ruins which accuse you when you utter the word peace at present."

"That is perfectly true," exclaimed M. François Laur, a Boulangist and former follower of Gambetta. "Gambetta," he said, "wanted to pacify parties, but his *entourage* prevented him, and then M. Ferry thrust himself into his place."

This is a remarkable admission, and gives a strong color to the suspicion that Gambetta was hurled from power and put out of the way because he was in favor of stopping the war made on religion.

"I say," continued Count de Mun, "that when you took office in 1879; you could have done anything. What have you done?"

"To gain the favor of the Radical party, and to obtain the popularity of an hour, you wilfully lighted the flames of religious warfare. You cut your country in two. On the one hand are the Jacobins, men who believe in nothing, and who want everybody to be like themselves; the men determined at every risk to get rid of priests, of the Christian Brothers and the nuns; and, on the other side, all those who believe, who practise any religion, as well as those—mark me well—who have any care of the freedom of the human conscience and the independence of human souls.

"These are the two Frances which you have made. And this republic which you had undertaken to render acceptable, in spite of the sad antecedents it had in history, to a country wearied with divisions and strife, you have succeeded in making it uninhabitable for more than one-half of our citizens.

"This is what you are responsible for. You are aware of it, and you are anxious, while avoiding to compromise yourself by outward acts of repentance, to pause on the road you have been following and to retrace your steps. . . . For the time of the general elections is near at hand. You have to account for your deeds. Religious warfare is not so much in vogue as of yore. It does not satisfy the people you have deceived, nor the country which has had enough of it, and which demands something else."

"What else?" exclaims a member of the Left.

"I shall tell you unhesitatingly," replied M. de Mun. "The country simply asks to be rid of your dictatorship (*i.e.*, that of the Radical majority), of your dictatorship, which is the most intolerable of all.

"People begin to understand that they have to retrace their steps; and so they quietly turn towards us, not with any expressions of regret for what they have done, but with a conciliatory tone. You come like one well-intentioned, who only asks for peace, for peace with everybody,—and who is ready to come to a good understanding with us, with these good *curés*, and these excellent fathers.

"And did you really believe that we were going to accept all that? No, no! (Applause and laughter.) No, sir; never! It is too late,—understand it well; it is too late!"

It is thrilling to read this magnanimous defiance uttered by the foremost orator of Catholic France, just when, after a century, religion seems absolutely at the mercy of the anti-Christian revolu-

tion. Triumphant unbelief seems to have possessed itself, with a power none can, apparently, resist or gainsay, of all the schools of France, of all the sources of public instruction ; and all the means at the disposal of the Government are used to inculcate the baldest atheism and materialism.

Yet the sons of the Crusaders,—of the men who followed King Saint Louis to Egypt, and who fought and died by his side on the plague-stricken shores of Africa, stand forth in 1889 and pledge their efforts, their money, their lives, to rescue the land of France and her young generations from the invasion of worse than Mohammedan barbarism and corruption. The noble purpose which fires, at this moment, the generous men who stand arrayed around Albert de Mun, is not to rescue the tomb of Christ or the city in which He died from the domination of the Moslem, but to preserve France, her living millions, and her millions yet unborn, to the faith of Saint Louis.

American Catholics, those especially of Irish blood, may well sympathize with their brethren in France. The long battle against the British Government and the Irish Establishment for Catholic education did not end with the life and labors of John of Tuam. Archbishop Whately, of Dublin, was no whit less hostile to Catholicity than Jules Ferry and Paul Bert. And he and the Godless system of education which he had devised would have achieved their deadly purpose in Ireland had not John MacHale stood like a wall of brass between the young Catholic generations and their would-be educators.

The present Archbishop of Dublin is only taking up and laboring to complete the work of John of Tuam. He will surely succeed—as surely as Count de Mun and the Catholics of France will save French youth and France itself from the degrading yoke of Jules Ferry.

THE FIRST CHRISTIAN NORTHMEN IN AMERICA.

IN the issue of this REVIEW for last July we alluded to the noble co-operation of the Popes and the powers in the ninth and tenth centuries in extending Christianity throughout Europe, and to the appointment of St. Ansgar as Apostolic Legate to the northern nations by Pope Gregory IV. We will here introduce a translation of the noted Bull of that Pontiff, whereby he appointed St. Ansgar, and wherein he refers to the efforts of Charlemagne and his son, Louis le Debonnaire, for the propagation of the faith. The introduction of this Bull is also important in connection with the debated question as to the time of the discovery of the western continent by the Northmen. This famous Bull was issued in 835, and we give the document at length as found in the *Bullarium Romanum*, published at Rome in 1739, volume i., page 174, including the words "*Norwegians, Faroë Islands, Greenland, Zealand, Iceland, Scridevindum*," which we have placed in brackets and in *italics*, as upon these words turn the question as to when Greenland was discovered by the Northmen, and when that country became the object of Papal solicitude and missionary labor. If those words in *italics* properly belong to the Bull, then Greenland was discovered prior to 835, when the Bull was issued. Claudius Christophessen, the author of some Danish verses relating to Greenland, supposes that Greenland was discovered in the year 770, but he gives no reasons for his belief. Crantz, relying upon the date of the Bull of Gregory IV., places the discovery and colonization of Greenland in 830. M. Peyrene relies upon the same date for determining this question, and many authors, ancient and modern, have followed the same view. Rev. B. F. De Costa, author of "The Pre-Columbian Discovery of America by the Northmen," while in his work he pronounces the Bull of Gregory IV. as "*beyond question a fraud*," and says "Gunnbiorn (876) was undoubtedly the first to gain a glimpse at Greenland," made inquiry of the present writer how the question could be investigated in the Roman archives, and then thought of visiting Rome with the view of searching for the solution of this date; this was before the election of Pope Leo XIII. and the opening of the Vatican Library to the researches of scholars. We will return to this question again. For the present we insert the Bull of Pope Gregory IV. for the purpose of illustrating how the Sovereign Pontiffs of that age, as well as those of every age down to the illustrious and truly apostolic Pontiff in our own days, have been ever inspired with an extraordinary zeal for the conversion of the far-off and heathen nations, and how this zeal under Gregory

IV. and Leo IV. and their successors led to the first introduction of Christianity into America.

“GREGORY, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD.

“We desire that it be known to all the faithful that his Most Gracious Majesty, King Charles, of happy memory, in the time of our predecessors, influenced by the Divine Spirit, subjected the Saxon Nation to the Christian worship, and, in taming their fierce spirit, spread the yoke of Christ, which is sweet and light, even to the confines of the Danes and Slavonians; and had resolved to establish, in its own episcopal vigor, the remotest part of his own kingdom, beyond the Elbe, that lay exposed to the greatest dangers from the pagans, in order that it should not relapse into the worship of the Gentiles, and also because it seemed best adapted for gaining new nations to the Faith.

“But as death intervened, he was succeeded by his Most Gracious son, the Emp. Louis Augustus, who effectually carried out the pious design of his saintly father. Through the venerable Bishops Rotold and Bernold, and likewise Gerold Comes, and venerable Missus, tidings have reached us of the confirmation of this scheme. We accordingly, recognizing therein God's gracious providence, and likewise instructed by the presence of our brother and son, Anscharius, who was consecrated first bishop of the Nordalbingians (inhab. of country N. of Elbe), by the hands of Drogo, Bishop of Metz, have resolved, after the custom of our predecessors, to confirm the holy zeal of the great emperors, as well by the present sanction as by the donation of the Pallium; and that our aforementioned son, armed with this high sanction, and his successors, zealous for the conversion of nations, may be more secure against the attacks of the evil one, we appoint our son, Anscharius, above mentioned, and his successors, along with Ebbo, Archb. of Rheims, legates of all the surrounding Nations of the Danes, Swedes, [*Norwegians, of Farøe Islands, Greenland, Zealand, Iceland, Scridevindum*], of the Slavonians, and of the Northern and Eastern Nations, by whatever name they are called; standing before the body and tribunal of St. Peter, we confer upon them the public function of evangelizing, and ordain that the See of the Nordalbingians, called Hamburg, dedicated to the honor of the Saviour and of His holy and inviolate mother, the Ever-Virgin Mary, be henceforth archiepiscopal. But the consecration of succeeding priests, until the number of consecrators be increased from among the nations, we in the meanwhile intrust to the care of the Sacred Palatine. An energetic preacher, qualified for so important a charge, must be always chosen in succession; and all his pious projects, allotted by his Ven. Prelate, in view of this divine office, we by our sanction

confirm; and every one resisting, contradicting, or attacking in any way these our pious designs, we anathematize and condemn to everlasting punishment, as guilty of complicity with the evil one, in order that, in imitation of our Predecessors, we may fortify more securely, against attacks on every side, the Apostolic dignity and those who are piously zealous in the cause of God. And because the Divine Clemency had ordained that you, most loving son, Anscharius, should be the first Archbishop of the new See, we also invest you with the Pallium, for the celebration of the solemn rites of the Altar, and confer it upon you, to use in your days and, with its privileges perpetuated, upon your Church. Hence you must preserve the honor of this vestment, by the purity of your morals, for if shepherds, exposed to the sun and to the cold, in the care of their flocks, with ever-watchful eyes, take care that none of them be lost, or be torn to pieces by the jaws of wild beasts, let us consider with what toil and vigilance we, who are called the pastors of souls, should attend to our charge. We advise you to refrain from involving your charge in any way in temporal affairs. Be your life, therefore, a guide for your sons; let them thereby regulate whatever fortitude they possess, and therein behold what they are to imitate, so that it shall seem to be your gift, after God, that they should live well. Let neither prosperity, which pleases for a time, elate, nor adversity afflict, your heart; let the wicked know that you are severe, and the benevolent feel that you are kind. Let not another's malice render the innocent guilty in your eyes, nor favor pardon the guilty one; let your protection be extended to the widows and orphans that are unjustly oppressed. These, most loving brother, among many others, are the peculiar attributes of the Pallium, and by your zealous observance thereof you shall possess interiorly what you will show that you have received from without.

"May the Blessed Trinity vouchsafe to preserve your Fraternity many years in security, and after the trials of this life, lead you to perpetual bliss. Amen."

Viewing this document merely in a historical aspect, it would appear from its language, including Greenland among the countries confided to the Apostolic care of St. Ansgar, that Greenland had been discovered and colonized at the time of its date, 835; but as there were many historical evidences that Greenland was only discovered at a later date, doubts were cast upon the authenticity of the Bull itself. We have found this important document in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists and in all other collections of the Papal Bulls. But from the *Acta Sanctorum* we discover that the Bull of Pope Gregory IV., as given in the *Bullarium Romanum*, had been altered, and that the words which we have

placed in brackets and in *italics* had been interpolated in the Bull. In the *Acta Sanctorum*, Palmé (Paris, 1863), first volume for February, at page 407, we read under the heading, *Legatio S. Ansharii ad Aquilonares populos*, a passage which we translate as follows:

"The Papal Bulls and the documents of the emperors would satisfy us, and, in addition, the Acts of Saints Ansgar and Rembert, and still further what we have already said concerning the Slaves, the Danes, and the Swedes, were it not that the acts themselves, which are often interpolated in the past in the Budecensian and Hamburgensian codices, extend the jurisdiction of St. Ansgar to the *last known* and *most remote* regions, in which St. Ansgar is said to have been appointed by Gregory IV. and confirmed by Nicholas I. as legate over all the surrounding nations of the Swedes, Danes, Faroës, *Greenland*, Iceland, Scridevindum of the Slaves, and, furthermore, of all the northern and eastern nations, by whatever names they are called. Which (decrees) in the Acts of St. Rembert are repeated in the same words, of which acts we are at present able to procure no copy except from the same MSS. German codices. Pontanus in his fourth book *Rerum Danicarum* shows this diploma of Gregory IV. to be interpolated in the same form of words; the mention of the Faroës, Greenlanders, Zealanders, Icelanders, Scrichfinders being intruded: which words, moreover, are absent from the genuine French codices of the Acts of St. Ansgar, published at Paris and Corbie, and from the Pontifical diplomas of the Hamburg Codex published by Philip Cæsar, one of which diplomas of Pope Nicholas Krantz transcribes in the First Book of the *Metropolis*, chapters 38 and 39, and from him Baronius, in the year 858, section 14; where St. Ansgar is appointed legate over all the surrounding nations of the Swedes and Danes and also Slaves, and over those nations, situated in whatsoever parts, in which divine piety has opened the door. Which words, finally, the Catalogue of Bishops joined to the Acts of Saints Ansgar and Rembert, published by Philip Cæsar after the lapse of three centuries from the times of St. Ansgar, shows had by anticipation been transferred to those times; in which (writings) they are mentioned in the same order in chapter xxvii., under the title of List of Bishops."

Accordingly the Bollandists publish the Bull of Gregory IV. without mentioning the names of the Faroës, Greenland, Iceland, and Scridevindum. The following are the words of the Bull according to the Bollandists: "over all the neighboring nations of the Swedes or Danes and also of the Slaves, or over those nations, situated in whatsoever parts, in which divine piety had opened the door."

In the Life of St. Ansgar by St. Rembert, his contemporary and successor as Archbishop of the united dioceses of Hamburg and Bremen, we read :

“ Having been confirmed by Gregory IV., he is appointed Legate of the Northern nations. And that these things might remain established for all time, he (the Emperor) sent him (St. Ansgar) with every honor to the Apostolic See, and by his ambassadors, the venerable Bishops Bernold and Ratold, and the illustrious Count Gerold, and requested that all his acts in the premises be confirmed by Pope Gregory, which the Pope then, after the manner of his predecessors, approved both by the authority of his decree and by conferring the *Pallium*, and then and there appointed him the Apostolic Legate over all the nations of the Swedes as well as of the Danes, and also of the Slaves, and over all the other nations situated in the Northern Nations.” See also the *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 118, page 974, n. 20.

In another life of St. Ansgar, by the ancient monk Gualdo of Corbie, published also by the Bollandists in *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. i. of February, page 439, the same facts are stated, excluding Norway, Faroës, *Greenland*, Zealand, Iceland, and Scridevindum, in the following verses :

“ Papa beatificus Regis mandata probabit,
Ac pallæ tribuendo decus munimine sanxit
Juris Apostolici ; statuens ut episcopus orbi,
Barbara Danorum quem gens colit et Sueonum
Quemque colunt gentes Boræ glacialis ad arcem.”

It is not necessary to produce the Bull of the successor of Gregory IV., Pope Leo IV., which we have before us, and which contains the names of the same nations, omitting those of Greenland and the other interpolated names, in order to show that Greenland was not discovered, colonized, or Christianized before the end of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh centuries. St. Ansgar and his successors, as archbishops of the united dioceses of Hamburg and Bremen, had jurisdiction over the northern countries, and the dioceses of the latter were their suffragans, including the diocese of Lund. In 1099 Lund was raised to a metropolitan see, including within its jurisdiction the suffragan bishops of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, and all the northern countries. Two dioceses were erected in Iceland, one with its see at Skalholt, in 1055, and the other at Horlum, in 1106. Among the dioceses of Norway was that of Drontheim (Nidrosia), which, in 1154, was raised to the dignity of a metropolitan. In the meantime the episcopal see of Gardar, in Greenland, had been erected about the year 1121-22, so that the first episcopal see in the west-

ern world was suffragan to the Archdiocese of Lund and subsequently to the Archdiocese of Drontheim, in Norway. It is quite probable that at the time of the discovery and colonization of Greenland and the first advent of Christians there, the infant Church of Greenland was within the jurisdiction of the Archdiocese of Hamburg-Bremen, where Libentius I. (988) and Urvannus (1013), successors of St. Ansgar, were its archbishops. It is claimed by some writers that the first Bishop of Gardar in Greenland was consecrated by the Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen at Bremen, and this first bishop, Eric, was the Apostle of Vinland in our own country. There is some discrepancy in ancient and modern writers as to the date of the erection of the see of Gardar in Greenland, and in the names and dates of the first three or four bishops.

This is owing, perhaps, to the fact that the archbishops in those northern regions so far from Rome, and in those early days, were invested by the Holy See with a general power or privilege of appointing and consecrating bishops for those northern nations, and the Bull of Pope Leo IV. to St. Ansgar seems to confer that power upon St. Ansgar and his successors. Thus the records of the early appointments may have existed, not at Rome, but only in the archiepiscopal sees, which were destroyed, with all their archives, at the time of the Lutheran (so-called) Reformation.

In 876 Gunnbiörn discovered the rocks which bear his name, and which are on the route from Iceland to, near, and in sight of Greenland. In 982 Eric the Red made his first voyage of discovery to Greenland, and in 1000 Iceland received Christianity as its established religion. From the time of St. Ansgar Christianity had been introduced into Sweden and Denmark, and in the time of the Olafs it had made great progress in Norway. The first vestige of Christianity in the western hemisphere is the fact that the islands known as Cross Islands, and which Finn Magnusson suggests were the same as Gunnbiörn's Rocks, were also located there; and, in the absence of other theories, we venture to suggest that the name Krossæyar, or Cross Islands, may have been given them by the English and Irish monks who were in the habit of passing between their island homes and Iceland, and who had made their cells and shrines in the rocks and caves of Iceland before the advent of the Northmen. The ancient chronicles give an account of a party of men who had spent a winter on those barren rocks of Gunnbiörn, and it would seem from the Landanama Book that, though famous for shipwrecks, and barren and dangerous in the extreme, they were not absolutely uninhabitable. They may have afforded a temporary shelter to the first Christian monks, driven by storms out of their course from England to Iceland.

And yet we have preserved the song of the maiden, who, less brave than Christian monks, warned Björn against landing there :

" None may be guests
On Gunnbjörn's isles
Who have garments rich
And precious wares.

" The host shall destroy
His stranger guests
As the sow devours
Her new-born litter."

In our first article on the Northmen in America we gave an account of the various voyages of the Northmen to the western continent and to the shores of our own country, and of their discoveries and settlements in Greenland and in Vinland on our own coasts. Commencing, as these expeditions did, before Christianity became generally adopted in Norway and Iceland, the movement was entirely pagan in its commencement and in its first religious aspects, for through those first adventurers and Vikings the worship of Odin and Thor was introduced into the western world. But after old Eric the Red had spent two winters in Greenland, in 985 or 986, he had returned to Iceland and fitted out twenty-five ships, which were filled with colonists for the new country, to which Eric had given the deceptive name of Greenland. The fleet sailed from Borgarfjord and Bredefjord with hardy adventurers and restless sea-rovers from many parts, and here we get from the Landanama Book an account of the *first Christian in the new world*. One of the leaders of the expedition was the Viking Herjulf, and on board of his ship was a Christian man, a stranger from the Hebrides (Sydreger), with which remote islands the Northmen were in constant intercourse, and, indeed, it is an interesting fact that the old Norse name of the Hebrides is still perpetuated in our modern churches by the title of the Bishop of Sodor. The great fleet of Eric the Red was overtaken by terrific storms, and of the twenty-five ships that sailed only fourteen arrived at Greenland. Most of the others were wrecked on the inhospitable eastern coast of Greenland, and Herjulf's ship became entangled amongst the breakers. More fortunate than the others, his ship had on board the Christian from the Hebrides, who, at least, could address his prayers to the true God for the safety of the ship. It is to be regretted that the name of this first Christian is not given, either in the Landanama Book, the Grönland's Historische Mindesmærker, nor in any of the ancient Icelandic Sagas, for he was not only a Christian, but he was a Christian scald or poet of no mean ability, and was the author of the poem *Hargerdingr*. This Christian, in

the midst of the storm, arose on the deck of Herjulf's ship and sang his prayer for deliverance; and the safe arrival of the ship was attributed to his supplications. We will give the five following English versions of this first Christian prayer in the west from different sources:

"I pray to Him that is without sin,
The Lord that rules the halls of Heaven
That arch over this our earth,
I pray that He will hold His strong hand over me."

—*Dublin Review*, 1849.

"Oh, Thou who triest holy men!
Now guide me on my way.
Lord of the earth's wide vault, extend
Thy gracious hand to me."

—*Beamish*.

"May he whose hand protects so well
The simple monk in lonely cell,
And o'er the world upholds the sky,
His own blue hall, still stand me by."—*De Costa*.

"I to the monk's protector pray
That he will give my voyage luck!
The heaven's great Ruler
Save me from danger."—*De Costa*.

"O thou, who holy men dost try,
Benignant,—Guide me on my way;
Of heaven and earth, thou Lord on high,
From ill protect my path alway."—*J. T. Smith*.

Leif Ericson, son of Eric the Red, returned to Norway in 994 from his first voyage to Greenland, where his father remained, after having become there the founder of a growing colony. With the exception of the Christian colonist from the Hebrides all was pagan in Greenland, and there were erected the altars of Odin and Thor, who had no more earnest worshipper than Eric the Red. In Norway Leif Ericson met Biarne Heriulfson, son of the Viking whose ship had been saved from destruction by the Christian's prayer, who had also returned from the New World, after having discovered and coasted along the shores of our New England States, and all Iceland and Norway were excited over the startling news. Leif Ericson, having gone next to Norway, in 999, visited the zealous Christian king, Olaf Trygvasson, was received most graciously at the royal court, and became a guest of the king. As stated by the article already quoted from the *Dublin Review*, "that most Christian, but somewhat impetuous monarch seems on this occasion to have employed soft words instead of

his more usual argument of the sword." And the ancient Icelandic narrative states that the king "exhorted him, as he did all pagans who came to him, to embrace Christianity, to which request Leif consented without any difficulty, and he and all his sailors were baptized." Under the persuasive arguments of the king, Leif Ericson, having become a zealous Christian, and fired with a true Northman's ambition, as well as with zeal to extend his newly embraced religion, determined to go again to the Western World in search of the land which Biarne had seen and had not explored. Having purchased Biarne's vessel, and having taken on board a crew of thirty-five picked sailors, he prepared to sail in quest of the land to the south of Greenland. King Olaf charged him with the glorious mission of converting the Greenland colony to the Christian faith, and with this view supplied the expedition with a priest and several other holy men, "*sacri ordinis*," probably monks. Leif's vessel was driven on the voyage to Greenland southward out of its direct course, and thus he saw and coasted along the American shores of New England. Arriving finally at his father's home at Brattahlid in Greenland, he was well received, although it is related that the old pagan reproached his son for bringing the Christian missionaries to Greenland. It is related in the *Grönland's Historische Mindesmaerker*:

"Leif straightway began to declare the universal faith throughout the land, and he laid before the people the message of the king, Olaf Trygvasson, and detailed unto them how much grandeur and great nobleness there was attached to the new belief, Eric was slow to determine to leave his ancient faith, but Thjodhilda, his wife, was quickly persuaded thereto, and she built a kirk nigh unto Brattahlid, which was called Thjodhilda's kirk. And from the time that she received the faith, she separated from her husband, which did sorely grieve him."

Here we have mention made of the first Catholic Church erected in the New World. The accounts differ as to the conversion of Eric the Red, for some of them represent him as finally embracing Christianity, which must have been followed by the reunion of his family, while other accounts represent him as remaining obdurate and dying a heathen. The following version is from Crantz's *History of Greenland*: "On his (Leif's) return he picked up several shipwrecked sailors who were swimming on the fragments of their vessels and brought them with him to land. His father was much displeased with him for this act of charity, and for bringing with him a Norwegian priest, dreading lest foreigners might find their way to his new settlement, and dispossess him. But he was calmed by the remonstrances of his son, who represented that in saving the unfortunates he had only fulfilled one of the common

duties of humanity, which nature requires of men, and which Christianity enforces still more strongly, and rewards more gloriously; he even consented to listen to the priest, and the result was that he embraced the Christian religion, and the rest of the colony followed his example." The same author says: "Greenland was continually receiving new colonists from the mother countries, part of whom were already Christians. Amongst these a wonderful story is told of one Thorgils, a new but zealous convert, who went to Greenland *in spite of his former gods*, and underwent a long train of persecutions from the Arch Fiend, together with many disastrous accidents by sea and land, after which, like Job and Tobias, he attained to great honor and happiness."

The founding of the first colony and the erection of the first Christian church were followed by the founding of a second and then of other and numerous colonies and the erection of many churches. As the population and settlements increased, Greenland was divided into two sections, one called Oestre Bygd, or Eastern settlement, and the other the Vestre Bygd, or Western settlement. The West Bygd at a later period contained ninety farms and four Christian churches; the East Bygd contained two towns, one hundred and ninety farms and twelve churches, including a fine Cathedral dedicated to St. Nicholas, and, according to Father Moosemuller, three monasteries, one of which was a convent of Benedictine nuns. But before proceeding to give an account of the church and convents of the western hemisphere in the eleventh and succeeding centuries, we will mention the first erection of the Christian cross in our own country. Leif Ericson, who, as we have seen, was the first Christian Viking to introduce Christianity into Greenland, in the following year undertook the great expedition southward which resulted in the exploration of the American coasts and the founding of a settlement of Northmen at Vinland, the location of which is now incontestably established at and about Newport, Rhode Island, and the southern portion of Massachusetts. It is probable that he carried with him one of the missionaries he had carried to Greenland, but of this we have no account. On his return voyage to Greenland he rescued the shipwrecked sailors of Thorer's expedition, including Thorer himself, and Gudrid his wife, the latter of whom became a prominent figure in the after-history of the Christian Scandinavia. In 1002 Thorwald, a brother of Leif, sailed for Vinland, and having spent two winters there, he made a voyage in his great ship along the coast of New England, landing at several places and exploring the country. In an engagement with the natives, whom they called Skraelings, Thorwald received a mortal wound from a poisoned arrow, and as the shadow of death came over the Christian Viking he called his

followers around him on the deck of his stout ship and telling them of his approaching end, he pointed out the place of his interment and the place where the cross should first be erected; he thus addressed his companions: "Now it is my advice that you prepare to return home as quickly as possible, but me you shall carry to the promontory, which seemed to me so pleasant a place to dwell in; perhaps the words which fell from me shall prove true (for he had before, in passing this point, said that he would wish to reside in so beautiful a spot) and I shall indeed abide there for a season. There bury me and place a cross at my head, and another at my feet, and call that place forever more *Krossaness*" (the Promontory of Crosses). Thus was the first Christian cross planted in our soil, at a spot now identified by historians and geographers as *Point Alderton*, southeast of Boston Bay. So also it should be mentioned that on the Dighton Writing Rock, which is situated six and a half miles south of Taunton, Massachusetts, on the east side of Taunton river, and is believed to bear an inscription commemorating the presence of Thorfinn Karlsefne, Gudrid, his wife, and one hundred and fifty Northmen, who accompanied the expedition, in 1007, the cross appears cut in the rock in several places and forms a part of this celebrated inscription. This inscription contains the forms of several human beings, and among them the forms of Gudrid and her son Snorre.

The history of Gudrid deserves a special mention. She was the most beautiful, accomplished and the most judicious of the Norse women in America, and yet her history is associated on one occasion with a ghost story and on another with a superstitious pagan ceremony. Daughter of Thorbjorn the Icelander, she was first married to Thorer the Eastman (Norwegian), and the rescue of her husband, herself and their sailors from shipwreck by Leif Ericson has already been mentioned. Her second husband was Thorstein, son of Eric the Red, and him, too, she accompanied on the perilous and unsuccessful voyage to Vinland and the New England coasts in search of the body of Thorvald, her husband's brother, who was buried at Crossaness. She and her family were among the earliest Christian converts in Iceland, and her life exemplifies the difficulties which beset the early converts from heathenism among the Northmen. So rude and warlike a people were slow to be withdrawn from all their old heathen usages and observances. Even in England, long after Christianity was established among the Anglo-Saxons, King Edward the Confessor is said to have put his mother to the proof of the burning ploughshares. Given to war and to the custom of drinking at their religious festivals in honor of Thor, the god of war, the early missionaries had great difficulty in weaning the converted Northmen from their old

customs, and in many instances they showed great skill in leading the rude Vikings to adopt better ideas and better habits. Having been as pagans the most zealous worshippers of Thor, the enemy and destroyer of giants, monsters, demons and every other typefied evil principle, now as Christians they became enthusiastic clients of St. Michael, the Archangel, the champion of good, the terror of evil, the defender of heaven and the conqueror of demons. Thus, in the beginning of the eleventh century they made pilgrimages to Mount Gorgona in Apulia, in honor of their new patron. Their love of war remained unabated, and they took an active part in the wars of the Lombards, Germans, Byzantines and Saracens for the possession of Southern Italy. The drinking orgies in honor of Thor were abolished by the Christians; the Catholic clergy organized guilds among the Scandinavian Christians in their place; each guild was named after a patron saint; the crooked drinking horns were replaced at the guilds with cups; the convivial guilds held their meetings and the habitual drinking of the Northmen was now done under the restraint of the public eye and of the presence of a presiding pastor; and though toasts were drunk in honor of the patron saints, these new restraints gradually led to the discontinuance of the custom. It is also a circumstance worthy of mention, as showing the esteem in which Christianity was held by the pagan Northmen, though one which must have subjected new Christian converts to disedification and trials, that the pagans sought the fellowship of the new Christians; for it is related in Gisle Surson's Saga that "at that time (about 962) Christianity had been introduced into Denmark, and Gisle Surson and his brothers in arms were received in Viborg as *Catechumens* (*Letu primsigne*), for this was a frequent custom among those men when out on trading voyages, and thereby they participated in all fellowship with Christian men."

Thorstein and Gudrid, returning from their fruitless search for the Promontory of Crosses and the remains of the Christian Viking, Thorvald, were thrown upon the western settlement of Greenland, at Lufsfjord, among strangers and without a shelter; they generously provided shelter for their seamen first, and thus, without shelter for themselves, they remained upon their ship. Then an inhabitant of Lufsfjord, Thorstein the Black, visited them and prevailed upon them to accept the hospitality of his home. The Icelandic Saga thus relates the incident and the ghost story: "Then was Christianity yet new in Greenland. Now it came to pass one day that some people repaired early in the morning to their tent, and the leader of the party asked who was in the tent. Thorstein answered; 'Here are two persons, but who asks the question?' 'Thorstein is my name,' said the other, 'and I am called Thor-

stein the Black, but my business here is to bid ye both, thee and thy wife, to come and stop at my house.' Thorstein said he would talk the matter over with his wife, but she told him to decide and he accepted the bidding. 'Then will I come after thee in the morning with horses, for I want nothing to entertain ye both; but it is very wearisome in my house, for we are there but two, I and my wife, and I am very morose; I have also a different religion from yours, and yet hold I that far the better which you have.' Now came he after them in the morning with horses, and they went to lodge with Thorstein the Black, who shewed them every hospitality. Gudrid was a grave and dignified woman and therewith sensible, and knew well how to carry herself among strangers. Early that winter came sickness amongst Thorstein Erikson's men, and there died many of his people. Thorstein the Black had coffins made for the bodies of those who died and caused them to be taken out to the ship and there laid; 'for I will,' said he, 'have all the bodies taken to Eriksfjord in the summer.' Now it was not long before the sickness came also into Thorstein the Black's house and his wife, who hight Grimheld, took the sickness first; she was very large and strong as a man, but still did the sickness master her; and soon after that the disease attacked Thorstein Erikson, and they both lay ill at the same time, and Grimheld, the wife of Thorstein the Black, died. But when she was dead, then went Thorstein out of the room after a plank to lay the body upon. Then said Gudrid, 'Stay not long away, my Thorstein!' He answered that so it should be. Then said Thorstein Erikson, 'Strangely now is our housemother (Grimheld) going on, for she pushes herself upon her elbows and stretches her feet out of bed and feels for her shoes.' At that moment came in the husband, Thorstein the Black, and Grimheld then lay down, and every beam in the room creaked. Now Thorstein made a coffin for Grimheld's body and took it out and buried it; but although he was a large and powerful man, it took all his strength to bring it out of the place. Now the sickness attacked Thorstein Erikson, and he died, which his wife, Gudrid, took much to heart. They were all in the room; Gudrid had taken her seat upon a chair beyond the bench, upon which Thorstein, her husband, had lain. Then Thorstein, the host, took Gudrid from the chair upon his knees and sat with her upon another bench just opposite Thorstein's body. He comforted her in many ways and cheered her up, and promised to go with her to Eriksfjord with her husband's body and those of his companions; 'and I will also,' added he, 'bring many servants to comfort and amuse thee.' She thanked him. Then Thorstein Erikson (the dead husband of Gudrid) sat himself up on the bench and said, 'Where is Gudrid?' Three

times said he that, but she answered not. Then she said to Thorstein, the host, 'Shall I answer his questions or not?' He counselled her not to answer. After this went Thorstein, the host, across the floor and sat himself on a chair; but Gudrid sat upon his knees and he said, 'What wilt thou, namesake?' After a little he answered, 'I wish much to tell Gudrid her fortune, in order that she may be the better reconciled to my death, for I have now come to a good resting-place; but this can I tell thee, Gudrid, that thou wilt be married to an Icelander, and ye shall live long together and have a numerous posterity, powerful, distinguished and excellent, sweet and well-favored; ye shall remove from Greenland to Norway, and from thence to Iceland; there shall ye live long and thou shalt outlive him. Then wilt thou go abroad and travel to Rome and come back again to Iceland to thy house; and there will a church be built, and thou wilt reside there and become a nun, and there wilt thou die.' And when he had said these words Thorstein fell back and his corpse was set in order and taken to the ship. Now Thorstein, the host, kept well all the promises which he had made to Gudrid, and in the spring (A. D. 1006) he sold his farm and his cattle and betook himself to the ship with Gudrid and all that he possessed; he made ready the ship and procured men therefor, and they sailed for Eriksfjord. The bodies were now buried by the Church. Gudrid repaired to Leif (her oldest brother-in-law and head of the family of Eric the Red), in Brattahlid, but Thorstein the Black made himself a dwelling at Eriksfjord and dwelt there so long as he lived and was looked upon as a very able man." Of this passage Mr. Beamish remarks: "This prophetic announcement of Thorstein Erikson is highly characteristic of the superstition of the times, and, although pertaining to the marvellous, is not the less corroborative of the authenticity of the narrative. 'Such incidents,' says Sir Walter Scott, 'make an invariable part of the history of a rude age, and the chronicles which do not afford these marks of human credulity may be grievously suspected as being deficient in authenticity.'" We might add that whether the prophecy preceded the sequel of events in Gudrid's life, or the facts in her subsequent life suggested the prophecy, the narrative corresponds accurately with what subsequently occurred to Gudrid.

In the next incident we shall relate of Gudrid she does not appear to the best advantage in a religious point of view. The description of a heathen incantation supposed to have taken place nearly nine hundred years ago, and, after transmission by oral tradition through the Scalds and Sagamen, reduced to writing historically by the monks of Iceland in the beginning of the thirteenth century, has been compared to the best literature of the

same kind in "Waverly" and the "Pirate," and is too unique for description. It must be given as the Saga renders it:

"At that time there was sore scarcity in Greenland; the men who had gone out to the chase returned almost empty-handed, and some, indeed, had never come back again. Now, there dwelt in the colony a woman named Thorbjörg, she was a spaewife (*spæ-kona*) and was called the lesser Vala. She had had nine sisters, and all were spaewives, but she alone survived. It was her custom in winter to travel around to the different guilds, and in particular was she welcomed by those who wished to know something of their fate, or of the prospects of the year. And as Thorkel was the chief man of the colony, so seemed it meet that he should learn when the scarcity which now pressed on them should be lightened. Thorkel invited the spaewife to his house; she came, and was well received, as was the custom when this sort of women were guests. A high seat was prepared for her, and a cushion (stuffed) with hens' feathers was laid thereon. But when she came after mid-day, conducted by the man who had been sent to meet her, she was clad after the following fashion: Her upper garment was blue and set with jewels down to her girdle, and she had glass pearls around her neck, and on her head a hat of black lamb's skin, lined with the skin of white cats. And she bore in her hand a staff, whereon there was a knob, ornamented with metal, and set all around with stones. Round her waist was a girdle fashioned of old and dry wood (*hniaskulinda*) and thereat hung a heavy purse of leather, wherein she carried her materials of incantation. On her feet were heavy calf-skin sandals, attached by long cords (or ties), each terminated by large tags of tin. On her hands she wore gloves of cat's skin, which within were white and shaggy. And as she entered the house, all men thought it their duty to greet her with honorable words, and Thorbjörg received each salutation graciously. Then Thorkel took her hand and led her to the seat that was prepared for her, and besought her to cast a favorable eye over his house and flocks. But she answered briefly to all that was said. Then was the table decked for the feast, and it behooves us to note what was prepared for the witch's meal. There was a porridge of goat's milk, and a dish of the hearts of all the animals that could be procured. Thorbjörg had a knife case of metal, and a knife of copper, which was fastened in a shaft of walrus tooth with two rings, but the point was broken off. When the feast was done, Thorkel addressed the spaewife and besought her to inform him and his guests of that which each most desired to know. Thorbjörg answered that she could say nothing until the next morning, till she had slept one night in the house. The next day, after noon, all was made ready for the incantation. And now the

witch commanded that they should cause to approach the women who could sing the magic song, and the song was called Vardlokkur, or the invocation of the protecting spirits. But in the house were no such women found, and they sought for them elsewhere. Then said Gudrid (Thorbjorg's daughter), 'Though I know not magic, and am no spaewife, yet did my foster-mother, Halldis, in Iceland, teach me a song which she called Vardlokkur.' 'Thou art lucky, Gudrid, with thy knowledge,' quoth Thorkel. But she answered, 'It is a song such as I do not hope for help from, for I am a Christian woman.' Then said Thorbjorg, the witch, 'It may be that you may do the guests some good thereby, and yet be yourself not less esteemed than you were before.' Thorkel now pressed Gudrid till she answered that she would sing. The women formed a circle around the magic mound, but Thorbjorg sate thereon, and Gudrid sang the song so clearly and so well that all thought they had never heard a voice so sweet. The spaewife thanked her for the song and said: 'Now are many spirits come to us, and find great joy in the sweetly-chanted song, who before would have kept themselves aloof, and would not have aided us, and now are many things clear to me which before were concealed. But I tell you, Thorkel, that the scarcity that now prevails will last only through the winter, and when the spring comes there will be plenty.'"

Gudrid, whose pagan name was Thurid, derived from the god Thor, on her conversion to Christianity is believed to have changed her name to Gudrid. As the winter of 1006 approached, Thorfin, who had also received the name of Karlsefne, which means *destined to become great*, an Icelander of munificent wealth and generosity, and of a noble character, visited Leif at Brattahlid, and when Christmas approached, and Leif apologized for the poorness of his stores of good things for the celebration of the festival, Thorfin Karlsefne opened his rich stores, and the festival was held with feasting and joy. "And after Yule" (Christmas), says the Saga, "Karlsefne disclosed to Leif that he wished to marry Gudrid, for it seemed to him as if he must have the power in this matter. Erik answered favorably, and said that she must follow her fate, and that he heard nothing but good of him; and it ended so that Thorfin married Thurid (Gudrid), and then was the feast extended, and their marriage was celebrated, and happened at Brattahlid in the winter." Gudrid accompanied her husband in his brave attempt to plant a colony of Northmen in Vinland, in 1007 and 1010, an account of which is given in our article on the Northmen in America in this REVIEW for April, 1888. It there occurred that a scarcity of food threatened the existence of the members of the expedition, and Christian prayers were offered up to heaven that they

might find an abundance of food. As their prayers were not immediately answered, Thorkel, who was evidently a pagan, pretended to pray for the same relief to the god Thor; soon afterwards a whale was found, and the hungry Northmen eagerly commenced to devour its fetid blubber; but when the pagan Thorkel taunted the Christians with the failure of their prayers for food, and alleged that the whale they were eating had been sent to them by Thor at his intercession, all the Christians immediately threw the whale into the water, and again looked famine in the face rather than countenance the pretensions of the pagan. Thorkel and all who ate the whale were made sick, and after this blasphemous pagan, with his ship and crew, had abandoned the expedition, the prayer of the Christians was heard, and their faith rewarded with an abundance of fresh fish and game.

In further illustration of the difficulties which the Church and her newly converted peoples had to undergo, especially where Christianity and paganism were face to face, struggling for the mastery, we will relate, from the Saga of Nial, that a female Scald is represented as saying to a newly converted Christian, "Do you not know that Thor has challenged your Christ to single combat, and that he dares not fight him?" No passage in all the Sagas and poems of the Scalds more thoroughly and characteristically illustrates the national sentiment of the Northmen, which recognized war as the arbiter of all things, even the sacred interests of religion. And we may add that Longfellow shows his keen appreciation of the same historic fact in the following pointed verses, in which he says that King Olaf

O'er his drinking-horn, the sign
He made of the Cross Divine,
As he drank, and mutter'd his prayers,
But the Berserks evermore
Made the sign of the Hammer of Thor
Over theirs.

Indeed, it is impossible for us easy-going Christians of the nineteenth century to understand the ordeal through which the Church and our ancestors in the faith have passed in the olden time, unless we consult and sedulously study the annals of the ancient Church, the antiquities of the national churches of Europe and the *Acta Sanctorum*.

Snorre, the son of Thorfin Karlsefne and Gudrid, was born in Vinland in 1008, in the State of Massachusetts; the precise spot is not known, but it is quite certain that it was near the present Buzzard's Point, in Massachusetts; he was the first Christian born within the limits of our country; they all returned to Norway, and finally to

Iceland, where Snorre became a man of influence and position ; after the death of Thorfin, Gudrid made a pilgrimage to Rome, and on her return to Iceland she entered a convent as a nun at Glaumbae, and nearby thereto Snorre erected a church for the convenience of his mother and her sisters in religion. Among the descendants of Snorre, besides the great sculptor, Thorwaldsen, were several Catholic bishops and other distinguished men and families ; the Saga thus speaks of them : "The daughter of Snorre Karlsefneson was Hallfrid, mother of Bishop Thorlek Runolfson. They had a son who Thorbjörn hight, his daughter hight Thorunn, mother of Bishop Bjorn Thorgier hight the son of Snorri Karlsefneson, father to Yngvild, mother of Bishop Brand the first. A daughter of Snorri Karlsefneson was also Steinum, who married Einar, son of Grundarketil, son of Thorvald Krok, the son of Thorer, of Espihol ; their son was Thorstein Raviglutr ; he was father to Gudrun, who married Jörund, of Keldum ; their daughter was Halla, mother to Flose, father of Valgerde, mother of Herr Erlend Sterka, father of Herr Hauk, the Lagman (the last compiler of the Landanama Book). Another daughter of Flose was Thor-dis, mother of Fru Ingegerd the rich ; her daughter was Fru Hallbera, Abbess of Stad, at Reinisness. Many other great men in Iceland are descended from Karlsefne and Thurid, who are not here mentioned. God be with us. Amen."

THE HOLY SEE AND THE GENTILES (461-604).

The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations. By T. W. Allies, K.C.S.G.
 London: Burns and Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1888.

IN these days, when men are tending more and more to close analysis in nature, art, and science, the beginning of life has become a very burning and prominent question. There is a growing distrust for ready-made opinions, and a proportionate tendency to dissect and anatomize. *Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*, the poet said in a heathen world, and at this hour of revealed religion every fact, every dogma, every development of a primeval truth, has to be carried back to its origin, and only such will stand the eternal siftings of men, that is, the restless cravings in time of an immortal intellect. In connection with physical science we may mention the discovery of the sources of the Nile, of steam, of luminiferous ether, as epoch-marking events, and even in the case of Darwin, where reason was unlighted by faith, the scientific world has been upheaved by the conclusions of a great mind gone astray whilst it confronted this question of origin. Newton's discovery of gravitation has no parallel in the physical world, but in the spiritual order it has been likened to the Blessed Sacrament, that cord which binds heaven to earth. The author of "The Formation of Christendom" has found out another analogy, and proved it, not with the unerring precision of mathematical problems, which is man's infallibility, but in the higher order of evidence furnished by historical facts. We say *higher*, because nowhere is the Hand of God more clearly seen than in the panorama of history. Gravitation itself affects the majority of men far less than those plain questions which must of necessity influence every human life. Our planet's position in space appeals chiefly to the learned, whereas the individual's course through life and beyond it is a personal one to each of us. The sources, then, of spiritual gravitation are laid bare, and we are told that "the heart of the Church throbbed in the Roman Primacy" with the overwhelming testimony of fact. We may say that it *is* throbbing, for loyalty to the Holy See is the distinctive mark of the Catholic. All other dogmas may be held, and yet if the seat of life be placed elsewhere than in the See of Peter, all the planetary gravitation in the spiritual order is awry. From the first, Mr. Allies has attached himself to the centre and bond of unity. Even as an Anglican he was

¹ *The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations*, p. 52.

erroneously true to the principle of supremacy as the axis on which everything turns, and since the dawn of light in his soul he has become the specialist of St. Peter's prerogatives. Twenty-seven years of labor expended on this study have produced "The Formation of Christendom," in other words, an account of Peter's Kingdom, which is marked with the folly of the Cross, a miracle strengthened by every age as it passes away whilst that Rock endures. The nobler the organ, the greater will be the specialist's fame, but the glory of *this* specialist will have been, and is, the recognition of the organ so labored for in unwearying years. We are far from assuming that he alone has defended Peter; what we *do* claim for him is the special aspect which he gives to the Holy See in the spiritual dispensation when he speaks of the Church's heart throbbing in the Roman Primacy. This sentence occurs in his latest volume, the sixth, of "The Formation of Christendom," but it is the mainspring of the whole work, and the key to his lifelong devotion to St. Peter's Chair.

In the "Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations" he deals with old and with new Rome; with an expiring empire and the perfection of the Roman peace; with new peoples, whom Divine Providence was preparing for Peter's garner; in short, with the decaying embers of old Rome and that Christendom which the Popes founded on those smouldering ashes. The period embraced by him in this volume, 455 to 604, contains as if in embryo what was to constitute the probation of the Church in after ages; by the side of Popes St. Leo and St. Gregory, a Pope Vigilius; the secular power wielded in the strong hand of Justinian, the great ruler, who respected the office, whilst he did not always spare the person, of the Pope; the wiles and plottings of the Empress Theodora, typifying the human element of corruption, which is ever at work in the body of the Church, but cannot touch its heart. If Christianity was founded by the Cross, so was Christendom, and it is to the whole view of Christendom, which was built up by the Popes as successors of St. Peter, that we would call attention in the volume before us. Nothing is vaguer than the general conception of Christendom. To most minds it means Europe in its present state; but how many people ever go back to the sources of its being, and ask themselves who laid its foundation? Then, how were its walls builded up? Mr. Allies will tell us as, we believe, no other does; we shall read in these pages of Christian Rome's travail, of the pastors, not wolf-nurtured as its first king, but nourished on the Lamb to feed the sheep. Parallel with old Rome ran the fortunes of the beautiful city which Constantine called Nova Roma, or rather, as the one decayed and seemed to die, the other raised her shining face to heaven. It was in the nature of human things

that the fulness of the Roman peace should have passed to Byzantium.

Scarcely had the seat of empire been removed to it than its see became jealous of old Rome's spiritual primacy, and if the Eastern emperor could not make it second to none, it was not for want of will. He had something else to contend with, and this was the power of the Crucified in St. Peter's successor, a spiritual radiation typified in the act of Pope St. Leo, who, unarmed and defenceless, had gone out to meet Attila, and saved the city by his personal influence. Leo's word, which forcibly recalls that of Leo's Lord in the garden, when the armed men fell down before Him, upon His saying, "*Whom seek ye?*" was set forth in "The Throne of the Fisherman."¹ The phase of crucifixion, so to speak, in the Papacy, is not yet over, though the voice of the whole Church has spoken at Chalcedon, and has acclaimed Leo "as entrusted by the Saviour with the guardianship of the Vine." To underrate the importance of this testimony, is practically to give up the Church and revealed religion, for "schism generates agnostics."² It is followed by the witness of facts: the fall of the Western Empire, which unmade Rome's temporal sovereignty, barbarian invasions which produced in it a desolation approaching to the darkness of Calvary, and the moulding of these men of the North, Pagan or Arian as they were, into living stones for a future Christendom. This was accomplished by the Holy See, the generator of the episcopate, because it was the bond of unity which held together elements so scattered. "Arians became Catholics, Teuton raiders issued into Christian kings, savage tribes thrown upon captive provincials coalesced into nations, while all were raised together into, not a restored empire of Augustus, but an empire holy as well as Roman . . . whose creator was the Roman Peter."³

It would be a small thing to assert these results if history did not bear them out, and to show that it does is the scope of the volume before us. It has been a labor of love to put together this page in the birth of spiritual Rome, which is obscure only because it is not known. We will venture to say that ignorance on the subject is no longer possible.

Few, if any, Catholic historians have considered the simultaneous rise of the new Rome and the old, the one typifying the secular, the other the spiritual power. There was a singular feature about the withdrawal from Rome of the Roman emperor, and the reduction of old Rome to the rank of a provincial town under an

¹ Being the fifth volume of *The Formation of Christendom*. It was published in the spring of 1887.

² *The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations*, p. 5.

³ Page 6.

Exarchate. It was as if Divine Providence wished to show whence the power of St. Peter's see came. All human elements of greatness were lavished on Byzantium and lacking in proportion at old Rome, and it was the radiation of the imperial court, its reflection, which gave lustre to its see. Byzantium would have had its state church if its claims had not been resisted by the Roman Peter, and the gates of hell would have prevailed if Cæsar had had his way. St. Leo had opposed the demands of St. Pulcheria and her husband that Nova Roma should have a spiritual rank secondary only to Rome. His seven successors "stood as one man,"¹ but their seven contemporaries at Constantinople showed unity of purpose only in one thing, subservience to the emperor, who made them what they were. Herein lies the interest and importance of the historical details so abundantly supplied by Mr. Allies. From Anatolius to John the Faster, the struggle was going on which really settled forever the burning question of the Primacy. Shorn by one stroke of imperial favor and of its human greatness, Rome made itself heard above the clamors of emperor and courtly bishop. Five times plundered, always, by its position, the goal of greedy invaders, it drew strength from Peter as Constantinople's bishop drew influence from the emperor. The claims which St. Leo had resisted were put forward later on, and the See of Nova Roma attained the second rank in the Church till the time when his prescience was borne out, and unsatisfied ambition developed into schism and heresy. The most that the new capital and its sovereign could do was to make an "ecumenical patriarch," for so he is called in the laws of Justinian. The process was a gradual one, extending over the one hundred and forty years from St. Leo to St. Gregory, and every succeeding Pope had the instinct of St. Leo. "We laugh," said Pope Gelasius to the then Bishop of Constantinople, "at the pretension to erect an apostolical throne upon an imperial residence."² The tower, nevertheless, was erected, and if it did not reach to heaven, that was not the fault of its builder. Whilst the Bishop of Constantinople was the second person in the East, claiming ecumenical authority over all except the Pope himself, he acknowledged the Primacy "seated in a provincial city, pauperized and decimated with hunger and desertion."³ That which ought to have made an apostolical throne, if it could be manufactured by human hands wielding all earth's strong things, should have unmade the Primacy if it had not been founded on the Rock. Behind the crumbling walls of Aurelian the Pope looked out on a wasted, perishing city, and called himself in the person of St. Gregory, not ecumenical patriarch, but "servant of the servants of God."

¹ Page 180.² Page 343.³ Page 345.

The pretensions and disloyalty of Acacius, to quote the most prominent amongst the seven bishops we have mentioned, served to bring out the true position of the Pope, just as controversy in our day illustrates a particular doctrine. The thirteen immediate successors of St. Leo were all saints. Then came one into Peter's Chair whose election was due to the manœuvrings of the Empress Theodora, and if ever Nova Roma, representing the pride of the world, should have prevailed against the Primacy, it was now. Not only had Theodora succeeded in making a creature of her own Pope, but Vigilius spent seven years at Constantinople, during which time he was harassed by unrighteous demands and deprived of his natural counsellors. Yet Vigilius had put on the Apostle, in whose place he sat. "If you have made me a prisoner, you cannot imprison the holy Apostle Peter,"¹ was his answer to Justinian, who, with all his generous instincts, was a petty persecutor.

If, on the one hand, the splendor, might, and empire of Nova Roma, whilst producing, we might almost say manufacturing, a patriarch, availed nothing against the Primacy, whilst the greatest of Eastern emperors, Justinian, bore witness to the Pope as head of all the bishops, this volume attests the creative power of the Popes in old Rome. Before laying the foundations of modern Christendom they built up, without stones, that city which was the capital on earth of their spiritual kingdom. Scarcely had the seat of empire been removed by Constantine than the very existence of Rome was threatened by the barbarians who swept over it with the devastating fury of an avalanche. Twice did St. Leo stay the arm raised to give Rome its death-blow. Attila and Genseric passed away, and still the city lived on in agonized life, yet those fierce invasions were only the beginning of strife. The warfare was carried on through three hundred years, and Christendom came forth from the Cross like the regenerating blood and water from the spear of the soldier. "The Papacy, delivered from the Western emperor, rose up, and the Church of Rome grew upon ruins. It took the place of the civil kingdom,"² says Gregorovius, who is no friend to the manifestation of Divine power, which he chronicles. The world is living just as much on the word of our Lord to Peter as on the creative word uttered in the beginning: "*Let there be light.*" Gregorovius speaks in this way because facts had spoken before him. The agony of imperial Rome lasted twenty-one years. After Attila and Genseric came Vitiges and Totila, who, though inflicting terrible misery upon her, stopped short of the Primacy, which was her vital element. Under Narses, the general of Justinian, who finally conquered her for his master at Nova Roma, "the spiritual power of the Primacy was the spring of all action."³

¹ Page 233.² Quoted p. 9.³ Page 294.

The abomination of desolation resulting from two centuries of barbarian horrors had reached its culminating point in St. Gregory's time, yet who, after St. Leo, typifies more remarkably than he the vitality of his see in a desolated city? From the moment when a heavenly vision consoled him as his plague-stricken people crossed the bridge of St. Peter's in the procession which he had ordered, till the end, when he laid down, at sixty-four, the burden of a life consumed by charity, his one care was for the Christian people, both at home and abroad. In Rome itself he fed the sick and starving with the patrimony of the Church; abroad he maintained the Primacy to the Empress Constantina, to the Emperor Mauritius, to the Lombard Queen Theodelinda, to the kings of the Franks and of the Goths, and identified himself with the Apostle Peter, and he brought together the ends of the earth in his pastorship by setting up the Christian faith in Britain, whose inhabitants were to be no more *Angli*, but *angeli*. Gregory worked with the mark of the cross upon him, knowing scarcely an hour without pain, and not one in which care for the churches did not trouble him. But more than that, he thought the end of all things was at hand, whereas he himself was laying everywhere the foundation of a people who were to endure as long as faith in Christ should be deemed a glory. Leo could contemplate the shadow of the great Roman peace, which had so lately departed; Gregory had before him another peace, an ideal one, as he looked upon it, and whilst he thought eternity was at hand, he built up time for the Church.

Another fact, in that history, proves the power of the Primacy, and this is the gradual conversion from paganism and heresy of Lombards, Goths, Franks, Saxons, and Alemans, a conversion noted by St. Chrysostom, as a spiritual sign which might compete with the miracles of the apostolic times. To realize what the bond of union offered by St. Peter's see was, let us suppose that those barbarous hordes had found Europe split up into national religions with as many creeds as countries, or, to take a concrete case, that they had invaded England in its present state with its hundred sects. What would have been the result? One of two things: The invaders would have clung to their native gods, and never have known our Lord, or they would have become the ancestors of our nineteenth century Agnostics, only the disease of unbelief would have set in before the world was so old as it is now. What actually happened was their gradual conversion to the one faith of Christ through the principle of unity represented by the Primacy. In no equivocal language Gibbon has spoken of Christianity's "two glorious and decisive victories: over the learned and luxurious citizens of the Roman empire, and over the warlike barba-

rians of Scythia and Germany, who subverted the empire and embraced the religion of the Romans."¹ In those days the Protestant element was represented by Arianism, a powerful enemy, which began by inveigling the new peoples into its rival camp, for to the Franks alone belongs the glory of having passed straight from Paganism to the pure faith of Rome. St. Peter had to deal not with a hundred false religions, but with one deadly heresy, which sat in high places. "The Catholic faith was considered throughout the West the mark of the Roman subject, and the Arian misbelief, the mark of the Teuton invader and governor."² Since Theodosius, Arianism had no longer a footing in the East, but the agony of the Western empire was troubled, perhaps increased, by this heresy, and at the time of its fall the Church was threatened by the loss of every advantage which the peace of Constantine had procured for it. "It was not a crowd of heresies which surrounded her, but the secular power at Rome, at Carthage, at Toulouse, and Bordeaux, at Seville and Barcelona, spoke Arian."³ "The dominant heresy of the West" could be overcome and rooted out only by unity, for let us imagine, again, the same phenomenon arising in our own time. Arianism has reproduced itself over and over again. Since the great revolt of the sixteenth century, men have persuaded themselves that opinions, not dogmas, should rule them, so that for those who can be illogical enough to believe this, there are soon as many religions as men, whilst for those who think in earnest truth ceases to exist. Arianism, then, or its equivalent, falling into a world with no spiritual centre of gravitation, would have been a fruitful mother of destructive children, and the stronghold of Christendom would never have been built. The division of the Roman empire in the fourth century prepared a wide field for the action of the Primacy in the heart of the Church. Its dealings were no longer confined to one temporal government. If, as Gibbon says, the constitution of modern nations is largely due to the Church acting through her bishops, these were in their turn held together by the successor of St. Peter. It was this unity of all members under one head which saved the world from becoming Arian, and preserved undimmed the light which enlightens every man coming into this world.

In the course of an article we can do no more than point out the great lines of an argument which is carried over the space of two hundred years. These are of capital importance and will illustrate our starting-point, that what the heart is to the human body, or the centre of gravitation to the universe, that is the Primacy of St. Peter in the spiritual fabric of the Church. To Mr. Allies belongs the glory

¹ Page 325.

² Page 47.

³ Page 50.

of this illustration, and of a life spent in the service of this dogma. "The Formation of Christendom" may be called its monument; neither flaw nor blemish can be found in the title-deeds which rest on Our Lord's commission to St. Peter. This volume completes the work up to the time of St. Gregory the Great. The whole purpose of the author will be carried out only when he has entirely built up the fabric of Christendom. There will be no missing link in the chain of human evidence, and as to the divine, we think readers of "The Holy See and the Wandering of the Nations" will admit that the finger of God is here. First, we are shown the Papacy living on the Cross in absolute dearth of first necessities, living a strong life in the midst of death and destruction; unarmed, defenceless, and crucified, doing battle to all the forces of this world combined at Nova Roma. Then, we find the Popes building up a city without stones, the fortress of St. Peter in the heart of Pagan Rome, and lastly, gathering the new Gentile world into the Apostle's garner. They raised their structure with living stones, and filled the uttermost ends of the earth with the new seed of Abraham, fit emblem of the heavenly Jerusalem which the kingdom of St. Peter typifies in this world:

Cœlestis urbs Jerusalem
Beata pacis visio,
Quæ celsa de viventibus
Saxis ad astra tolleris.—'Αλθις.

THE UNIAT CATHOLICS IN RUSSIA.

IN June of this year a Jubilee celebration of a remarkable kind was held in Russia under the auspices of both State and Church. It was a commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the decree of the Emperor Nicholas, by which the Catholics belonging to the Greek rite within the former Polish provinces were forcibly incorporated with the schismatic State Church. The celebration was held at Wilna, the capital of Lithuania, formerly an integral part of Poland, but now classified as one of the western provinces of Russia. Wilna has long been one of the most Catholic cities of the north of Europe, a fact which made more evident the political meaning of the official celebration, for purely official it was. The ancient city of the Jagellons was crowded with Russian officials and Russian troops, and on the 19th of June and the two following days the schismatic clergy and the governor of the province held solemn festival to commemorate the establishment of the schismatic State Church in Catholic Lithuania. With the customary audacity of Russian officials, the ukase of the Czar, which made the profession of the Catholic faith an act of treason for nearly two millions of his subjects, was described as an emancipation from Latin tyranny and the restoration of religious peace. The Russian Government proclaims the fullest toleration for all religions, and its assertions are widely believed outside Russia. It is well that, in America, at least, we should have a true idea of what this so-called liberty of conscience means for Catholics. The history of the suppression of the Uniat Church in Lithuania is an example of it, and it recalls the days of the English Henry the Eighth.

Before the iniquitous partition of Poland between Russia, Prussia and Austria, the Polish territory extended from Turkey to the Baltic, and from a few miles east of the Oder to beyond the great rivers Dwina and Dnieper, comprising an extent one-half greater than France has to-day. Its population of eighteen millions was more than three-fourths Catholic, excepting from the reckoning the Jews and the Mahometans scattered over its territory. In one respect the Catholic Church in Poland had a peculiar character. Its members were divided into two rites—the Latin or Western, identical with that of Western Europe, and the Uniat or Greco-Slavonian, which in its services and church language agrees with the Russian schismatic Church, but differs from it in acknowledging fully the supremacy of the Holy See.

The Uniat Catholics have a hierarchy of their own, distinct from

the Latin Bishops, even in the same districts, and wholly independent of their jurisdiction. Where a Latin and a Uniat diocese exist in the same city, as in Lemberg in Austria, the authority in church matters of each bishop is confined to the clergy and laity of his own rite. To a Latin Catholic the position of the Uniat archbishop is the same as that of the Archbishop of Boston to a Catholic of New York. He may attend mass in a Uniat Church, confess to a Uniat priest or receive the sacraments from his hands, but in all disciplinary matters he must be guided by the rules of his own bishop. In general discipline the most important differences between the two rites are that the Uniat liturgy is in the old Slavonian language instead of Latin, and that celibacy is not required of the parochial clergy. In these points the Polish Uniat follow the example of the Eastern Church, from whence their first missionaries brought Christianity to them and the Russians. The Holy See has, from the earliest times, recognized the existence of the different rites within her communion. The Armenian, the Syriac, the Chaldæan and Coptic rites, as well as the United Greek and Slavonian rites, are all integral parts of the Catholic Church. Saints of all have been canonized by the Roman Pontiffs, and the Uniat martyr, St. Josaphat, is among the most illustrious of modern Catholic saints. The Uniat Catholics of Poland have given ample evidence in our own day that their attachment to the Church is as strong as that of the most Catholic nations of the West.

In Poland, before its territory was dismembered by the three Powers, the Uniat Catholics were a larger body than their Latin brethren. The Polish kingdom, though under one government, was made up of three races—the Poles, properly so-called, in the west, the Lithuanians, a non-Slavonic race with a totally distinct language in the northeast, and the Ruthenians in the southeastern and eastern provinces adjoining Turkey and Russia. Generally speaking the Poles belong to the Latin rite, having received their missionaries from Bohemia and Germany, and the Ruthenians are or were Uniat. In Lithuania the population was almost equally divided between the two rites. Though somewhat less in numbers, however, the Latins formed the more important part of the nation politically, from their higher standard of cultivation. The Poles and Lithuanians were the warrior races, while the Ruthenians had been conquered by the Tartar invaders in the thirteenth century, and their old civilization rudely shaken by the Tartar dominion. Though all were politically equal, there was consequently a tendency on the part of the educated Ruthenians to pass over to the Latin rite, although the practice was discouraged by the Popes and the Church. As a result, the mass of the Uniat were a peasant population and their clergy, though zealous and

devoted, were not in point of cultivation equal to their Latin colleagues. The Russian Government, immediately after its first seizure of Polish territory, took advantage of this state of affairs to make a distinction between the Latin and Uniat Catholics. Both had been guaranteed freedom of religion by the treaty of partition, but Catherine of Russia was utterly unscrupulous in regard to promises or treaties. Personally she was wholly indifferent to any religion, but the policy of the Russian government had always been to enforce strict conformity with the State Church on its subjects as far as possible, and this policy she at once proceeded to apply to her conquests in Poland.

The first partition of that ill-fated kingdom in 1772 gave to Catherine the Ukraine and White Russia, with a population of some millions of Catholics. The Uniats, who formed the majority, had two dioceses in the ceded territory, while the Latins were subject to bishops in the still independent part of Poland. An assistant bishop, Siestrenczewicz, resided in the Russian territory, and Catherine, of her own authority, at once declared him the head of the Latin Church in her dominions. To prevent worse consequences, the Holy See consented, in 1784, to establish the archbishopric of Mohilev within the Russian dominions, and accepted the nomination of Siestrenczewicz as its archbishop. The character of the first Archbishop of Mohilev has been graphically described by Joseph De Maistre, but here it need only be said of him that he proved a docile instrument in the hands of Catherine for undermining the liberties of the Catholic Church. The fate of the Uniat Catholics was, from the commencement, separated from that of their Latin brethren. With the latter Catherine was satisfied to proceed slowly. She forbade their clergy to communicate with Rome except through the government agency, and she hampered their action by the numerous methods familiar to despotic government, but she did not deprive them of all religious freedom. With the Uniat Catholics her course was different. In spite of the toleration proclaimed in the treaty of partition, no sooner did she see herself mistress of the Ukraine than the Uniat bishops were expelled and schismatic bishops installed in their place. The Catholic churches were seized for schismatic worship and the Catholic priests replaced by schismatics through four-fifths of the parishes. In numerous cases it was declared by the Russian officials that the villages demanded schismatic priests, and such communities were at once officially declared to have joined the State Church. Thenceforth any of their members who professed himself a Catholic was treated as a criminal. The heads of families were sent into exile, their property was confiscated, liberty of conscience had no existence for them. How these so-called con-

versions in mass were actually effected may be gathered from the history of the Uniats of Lithuania, who were officially brought into the State Church within our own day, an event that will be briefly sketched hereafter. We will only say here that, according to Count Dmitry Tolstoi in his history of Catholicity in Russia, over one and a half millions of Catholics were thus incorporated officially with the schismatic Church in the last two years of Catherine's reign, and that Father Lescœur estimates the total number torn away from the Catholic communion during the reign of that empress at eight millions.

The reigns of Paul and Alexander the First gave a truce of thirty years to the Catholic Church in Russia. The first-named sovereign put a stop to the forced conversions, and concluded a concordat with the Holy See during the imprisonment of Pius VI. By this, three dioceses were established for the Uniats in place of five which had formerly existed, and six for the Latin Catholic Church in Russia, exclusive of one Uniat and eight Latin dioceses in Poland. It must be remembered that the provinces taken from Poland by the first and second partitions are regarded by the Russian Government as Russian and not Polish provinces. What has been styled the kingdom of Poland since 1815, when it was constituted by the Congress of Vienna, is a territory around Warsaw of about one-fifth the extent of the former independent Polish State. Its administration, until lately, has been quite distinct from that of the rest of the empire, though still subject to the despotic will of the Czar, and the higher state of civilization of its people has been some slight barrier against official tyranny. The eastern and southern provinces of old Poland are always officially described as the western provinces of Russia, and it is there that is to be found almost the whole Catholic population. The diocese of Saratoff in the south, around Odessa and Saratoff, where the Catholics are mostly German colonists, is the only body of Catholics in Russia that is not of Polish origin, however they may be styled officially.

Alexander I. continued the toleration inaugurated by his father, though the millions of Uniats forced into schism by Catherine were still retained in it by the force of the law. The Uniats of Lithuania, and those of the southern provinces that had escaped registration as schismatics during Catherine's reign, were allowed the exercise of their religion with comparative freedom, though forbidden, under the severest penalties, to receive their late brethren into communion. When Nicholas ascended the throne, in 1825, the Catholic Uniats in his empire numbered a million and a half, in four dioceses, and the Latin Catholics in the western provinces, outside the so-called kingdom of Poland, about two and a half mil-

lions. Within the kingdom the Catholics numbered nearly four millions, including the Uniat diocese of Chelm.

From the beginning of his reign hostility to the Catholic Church appears to have been a passion with Nicholas. A giant in stature and strength, and indomitable in will, with a fanatical belief in the divine right of his own power, Nicholas of Russia was the perfect type of a Russian despot. The Polish insurrection of 1830 excited in him a fierce hatred of everything Polish and Catholic. Two years before that event, indeed, he appears to have resolved on the destruction of the Uniat Church in Russia, but the failure of the insurrection gave him at once the means and a pretext for carrying out his plans. Those plans were laid with a skill equally clever and unscrupulous. The Czar publicly professed his respect for the Catholic Church and its head, and maintained an envoy at Rome as a proof of his amity with the Holy See, while he was plotting the destruction of Catholicity in his dominions. He found a suitable instrument for his work in a Uniat priest, Siemasko, whose career strikingly resembles that of the English Cranmer, and who lent himself, heart and soul, to the work of destroying Catholicity among his countrymen.

Joseph Siemasko was a native of Lithuania, and after his ordination had been appointed a member of the Catholic College at St. Petersburg. The latter is a kind of ecclesiastical board appointed by the Russian Government for the general administration of the Catholic Church in its dominions. It is copied from the "Holy Synod" of the State Church, which, since the abolition of the Patriarchate of Moscow by Peter the Great, has been the supreme power in that Church. As in the synod, the members of the Catholic College are appointed by the government, not by the Catholic Church or its head, and though some Catholic priests are among its members, there is no guarantee whatever of their orthodoxy. Siemasko's position in this college gave him an opportunity of fully learning the wishes of the Czar, and, with the prospect of fortune and power before him, he devoted himself privately to carrying them out. While openly professing his devotion to the Catholic Church, of which he was a priest, he presented, in 1827, a secret memoir to the emperor, in which he reminded him that Catherine had openly declared her intention of extirpating the Uniat Church in her dominions, and deliberately suggested the means that, in his opinion, were best adapted to attain that end. What those means were displays so well the character both of the man himself and of the Russian persecution that we will give a sketch of them as published in 1872 in the *Messenger of Europe*, a monthly review published at St. Petersburg with the indorsement of the Russian censorship. Were it not for such a witness, most

readers unacquainted with the Russian government would find it incredible that such methods should have been employed in a so-called religious propaganda.

In his secret memoir Father Siemasko reminded the Czar that Catherine, his grandmother, had determined to force all the Catholic Uniates into the State Church, and he recalled with approval the means she had employed for that end. The Uniates had been *invited* by the synod to join the schism, and her majesty had ordered the Governor Toutolmine to join *his action* to the invitation. He was specially directed to forbid any Catholic, whether priest or layman, to offer the *least opposition* to the propagation of the schism. The least attempt of such a kind was to be considered a high crime and punished with immediate confiscation. This threat, added Siemasko, *taken in connection with the state of siege* to which those provinces were subjected, produced its effect, and we saw orthodox dioceses spring up in Lithuania and especially in Volhynia and Podolia. It was true that when the vigilance of the local authorities was relaxed a strong reaction set in and the conversions to the State ceased altogether, while returns to the Catholic communion commenced on a large scale. Siemasko, the Catholic priest, carefully pointed out what appeared to him the chief causes of this change, and suggested to the emperor the most effectual means for renewing and perfecting the work of Catherine.

These measures embody a plan of Machiavellian craft for rooting out the Catholic faith. They were, first to create a state college or board of control for the Uniat Church which should have full control of its administration and of which the members should be all appointed by the Czar and devoted to his will. Secondly, to reduce the four dioceses then existing to two, and on the death of the actual bishops to permit to succeed them none but *sure men*, that is to say, men ready to obey the Czar even in opposition to the Pope. It must be remembered that the Russian Government had obtained from the Holy See the right of veto on the appointment of Catholic bishops within its dominions, such as the English Government, in 1814, tried unsuccessfully to obtain in Ireland and England. The third measure was to establish Government seminaries for the Uniat ecclesiastical students. These were to be nominally Catholic, but to be kept rigidly apart from all communication with the Latin clergy, and the professors and superiors to be appointed by the Uniat College, that is to say, by the Russian Government, whose creature it was. Finally, the monasteries and convents, which were among the firmest supports of the Catholic faith, were to be diminished as much as possible, and to be brought under the full control of the same college in the same manner as the schismatic convents are governed by the Russian Synod.

These measures were approved by the emperor, and steps were immediately taken to put them in execution. It is a striking comment on the morality of the system thus devised for changing the belief of a million and a half of Christians that the Russian Government professed to apply them with full respect for the Catholic religion, and while maintaining externally the most amicable relations with the Holy See. The author of the plot, Siemasko, was himself proposed on the next vacancy as a suffragan bishop and took the oath of fidelity to the Church and the Holy See while secretly bending all his efforts to destroy the faith of his flock. Subsequently, in 1833, he was appointed Bishop of Lithuania with the consent of the Holy See, which was kept in profound ignorance of his designs. To disguise the imperial projects more effectually, a perfectly devoted prelate of advanced age, Mgr. Bulhak, was nominated Archbishop of Polock, the other Uniat diocese, which was still permitted to exist. The government, however, succeeded in having a coadjutor appointed with him, Luzynski, who was fully involved in Siemasko's perfidy, and as the archbishop was obliged to reside at St. Petersburg, his coadjutor became virtually the ruler of the diocese. Siemasko also received a coadjutor, Zubko, who was devoted to his projects. Thus three secret apostates were vested with full canonical power over the Uniat Catholic Church, and enabled to mature their plans for its ruin with the apparent authority of the Holy See itself.

Siemasko lost no time in commencing his work. Assuming as a pretext that innovations had been introduced into the Uniat rite during the last century, he proceeded to assimilate its external practices to those of the schismatic church. The images and pictures in the churches were gradually replaced by Russian pictures in the peculiar metallic relief required by the schismatic discipline. The iconostases or rood screens, separating the sanctuary from the body of worshippers during the Mass, in Greek churches, had long been abandoned by the Uniats, but Siemasko ordered them to be introduced again. Organs, too, which are not used in Russia, he ordered to be removed from the Catholic churches, and the public Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament was forbidden as unknown to ancient usage. A more important step was the substitution of schismatic missals and breviaries for the Catholic books among the Uniatic clergy in 1834. This drew forth the warmest opposition. Fifty-four priests in one district addressed a petition to the emperor demanding the right to practise their religion in the manner of their ancestors, and scarcely a hundred out of eight hundred priests could be found to accept the new books. This resistance met with the severest punishment. Several were banished, others imprisoned, and all were charged with canonical disobedience to the Catholic

Church itself. Father Micewicz, of Kamienec, was subjected to six months' imprisonment on bread and water for this crime, and subsequently banished from the diocese. Meanwhile, as the faithful priests were removed, Siemasko filled their places with newly ordained candidates whose conformity to his own orders was secured in advance. The Archbishop Bulhak was powerless to interfere. He was practically deprived of all communication with his priests by the Government, and Luzynski, his coadjutor, assumed his authority at will. The Government made every effort to win Archbishop Bulhak to its views, but in vain. He steadfastly refused to acknowledge its authority or to separate himself from the Holy See, and the formal defection of the Uniat Church was postponed until his death in 1838.

It was officially made in the beginning of the following year. Siemasko, and the two coadjutors, Bishops Luzynski and Zubko, held a synod and petitioned the emperor and the Russian Synod to unite the Uniat Catholics with the State Church. The request was granted, of course. An imperial ukase was addressed to General Protasoff, the procurator of the Holy Synod (in Russia, military officers fill ecclesiastical functions), ordering that body to examine the petition and refer their answer to His Majesty. The synod duly obeyed, and admitted graciously the three Catholic bishops and the whole body of Uniat Catholics to the communion of the State Church "by the will of the Sovereign and Emperor Nicholas Pavlovitch, autocrat of all the Russias." The so-called union of the Uniats with the Schism was celebrated with official rejoicings throughout the empire, and by order of Nicholas a medal was struck to commemorate the event. It bore the legend, "Separated by hate in 1595; reunited by love in 1839."

What was the nature of the "love" which had brought about the supposed conversion was speedily made clear. The Czar and the schismatic synod had assumed the full right of three bishops deliberately and fraudulently appointed to betray their trusts, to change the faith of a million and a half of Catholics. According to Russian law, if the name of law can be applied to a system which emanates from the arbitrary will of an irresponsible ruler the Uniat Church in Russia outside of Poland had ceased to exist.

The Catholic population, however, in spite of its isolation, and the crafty measures taken for its deception, declined to accept the schismatic worship. In many places they refused to allow the schismatic priests to enter the churches, in others they absented themselves altogether from public worship. Several villages addressed petitions to the governors of provinces, and even to the Czar himself, begging to be allowed the exercise of the Catholic religion, but all in vain. The doctrine laid down during the last

century by an English judge, that the law did not recognize the existence of any Catholic within the British dominions, finds a parallel in Russia to-day. The Uniat Catholics had been declared schismatics by the law, and hence they could have no right to be Catholics, was the tenor of the answers given to all their demands. As these demands, however, had an unfavorable effect on public opinion, the authorities proceeded to suppress them vigorously. Troops were called into requisition, and the Catholic peasants were driven, at the point of the bayonet in many cases, into their own churches to the Mass of a schismatic priest, or even to receive a sacrilegious communion at his hands. The scenes which took place at Dudakowitz, a large village in the district of Vitebsk, in 1841, will serve as an example of the means used to force the Catholic population into the Schism. It is only one of many illustrations of the heroic attachment of the Lithuanians and Ruthenians to the faith from which the Government had publicly proclaimed their defection.

At Dudakowitz, in the beginning of the Holy Week, in 1841, two years after Siemasko's apostacy, a battalion of infantry was dispatched from Mohilev to enforce the attendance of the population at schismatic worship. The peasants gathered around their church and refused to admit the schismatic priest. They remained on guard day and night until Good Friday, when the soldiers commenced to burn their houses, and thus forced them to abandon their post. An old man named Lucas, who had been foremost in encouraging the resistance, with four others, was then arrested and required to profess conformity with the State Church. All five refused, whereon they were ordered to receive three hundred lashes each. Lucas, as the oldest and most respected, received his punishment first, and as each hundred lashes were completed, he was asked again if he would accept the Czar's religion, and on each refusal the blows were renewed. He was then removed to a cell in the neighboring convent, where he died the same night, after exhorting his children and grandchildren to remain forever faithful to the Catholic Church, and to bury him without any attendance of schismatic priests. One of his companions, named Gaspard, also died the same night, and a third, who survived, was sent prisoner to a schismatic convent at a distance from his home. Notwithstanding this example, the population of the town refused to abandon their faith, and during eleven years the church which had been handed over to the schismatics remained empty of worshippers. During that time they were deprived of all exterior worship; they baptized their own children and contracted marriage before the heads of the village, since no Catholic priest was allowed to approach them. Finally, in 1854, the Government ordered that the whole commu-

nity should be banished to Siberia in a body unless they consented to attend the State Church, and this menace at length forced them into external conformity with the Schism.

At Porozow, another village, the resistance of the Catholics was maintained up to 1862, and, indeed, it may be said to continue yet. On one occasion, all who refused to attend the schismatic service were sentenced to receive sixty lashes if men, and forty if women. Such were the means used to bring about the union which has just been commemorated in Russia.

The priests who refused to change their faith at the order of the Czar fared even more hardly. They were not only held guilty of apostacy from the State Church to which they had never belonged, but also of canonical rebellion against the bishops who had themselves abandoned the Catholic Church. Thus both civil and ecclesiastical penalties were poured on their devoted heads. Fourteen were imprisoned at Zachorow in 1840 in the former Basilian convent, where one, Father Slobotski, was left to die of hunger in a dark cell, and the others, after two years, were sent to finish their lives in different schismatic monasteries in Russia. A large number, estimated at from one hundred and six to a hundred and forty, were sent as convicts to Siberia. At Torokany, Father Baranowski, when imprisoned in the monastery, managed to address a petition to the Czar, and, by way of answer, was flogged and placed in a dark cell for several days. On opening its door at length his body was found stretched, without life, in an attitude of prayer. It was few, indeed, of those cases that came to the public knowledge. Once buried in the schismatic convents, the Catholic priests and monks who were imprisoned there were lost forever to sight. It must be remembered, that in Russia the publicity given to political events in America is utterly unknown. To criticise the acts of high officials is a crime which subjects those guilty of it to the severest penalties. The treatment of the Uniat nuns by Siemasko offers a striking instance of the secrecy which the Russian Government throws around the most atrocious acts of its officials. It is also a history of persecution unparalleled in modern times, and which recalls in our days the cruelties of the early persecutors of the Church.

Though there were a number of convents, both of men and women, in the Uniat Catholic Church previous to the apostacy of Siemasko, no account of their action in the question of a change of their faith was given to the world. It was assumed by the Russian authorities, and generally accepted by the outside world, that they had yielded to the pressure exercised on them and accepted the State Church doctrines either willingly or unwillingly. More than six years after the so-styled union of the Uniats to the

Russian Church, a woman, nearly exhausted with travel, and bearing on her person the marks of violent punishment, presented herself at the convent of the Sisters of Charity in Posen, in 1845, and asked for an asylum. She was the former abbess of the Basilian Catholic convent in Minsk, in the heart of Lithuania, several hundred miles from Posen, and had made her way on foot, after escaping from the prison in which the small remnant of her community was still expiating its fidelity to its faith. Of two hundred and forty-five nuns who had refused to abandon their faith, the Abbess Macrina Mieczyslawska alone escaped to tell their fate to Catholic Europe and the Sovereign Pontiff. The outburst of public indignation which her tale excited throughout Europe was immense, and the envoy of Russia to the Holy See, M. de Boutenieff, presented a note to the Pope in which he denied the possibility of such deeds having been done in his master's dominions, and endeavored to throw doubt on the fact that Sister Macrina had ever been in a Lithuanian convent. The note itself was a model of diplomatic evasion. A Paris journal, in giving its account of the abbess's relation, had inadvertently placed her convent at Kowno instead of Minsk, an error which was corrected in the following issue. M. de Boutenieff, in his note, attached himself mainly to this journalistic error, and declared that never had been a convent at Kowno, and that therefore the whole story was a fabrication. He further added that no nuns had been transferred to Russian convents, and that their convents had been left undisturbed, and even received new grants from the liberality of the Government. This fact would, if true, have been easily proved. It was only necessary to bring forward the testimony of the communities themselves, but that M. de Boutenieff carefully avoided attempting. Sister Macrina's story was submitted to a rigorous examination at Rome by a committee appointed by the Propaganda, and was found to bear intrinsic evidence of its accuracy. The abbess herself survived for twenty-four years in a Roman convent, only dying in 1869, and during that time she continued to impress the fullest confidence on the numerous visitors who came to examine her history, and on all who were in daily relations with her. Her account is too long for insertion here, but a brief summary of it, mainly told in her own words, will show how the Uniat Catholics of Lithuania were really "reunited" to the schismatic church of the Czar.

"During the summer of 1838 (that is, before the formal apostacy) Siemasko invited us three times in writing to go over to the Schism. Siemasko required that we should sign at the bottom of the invitation which he had sent us these words, 'We have read it,' which for him would have been equivalent to 'we have accepted

it.' After the third refusal he threatened us. Presenting himself in person for the first time after his apostacy, he asked me angrily: 'Why hast thou not signed the paper which I have thrice sent thee?' 'Because,' I replied, 'I have detected infamous falsehoods in it.' Seeing the same spirit in all our sisters, he cried out: 'I pardon thee on account of the emperor's benignity, who is willing to allow you three months for reflection; but if you persist in resistance, I announce to you all that you can imagine most terrible.' The third day after this scene, Siemasko, accompanied by the Governor of Minsk, Wznakoff, and a troop of Cossacks, broke open the convent gates at five in the morning, as we were going to the chapel. 'Where are you going?' he asked, and then added: 'This is the last moment of liberty that remains to you; you are still free to choose between keeping your property (with the additions which the generosity of the emperor is ready to make to it if you go over to the orthodox religion), or penal servitude and Siberia if you persist in your refusal.' 'Of the two, we choose penal servitude and Siberia rather than abandon Jesus Christ and His vicar on earth.' Siemasko then ordered the soldiers to remove us. At the church door I threw myself at the feet of the governor and asked permission to take leave of our Lord in the Holy Sacrament. He consented; and we entered the church and prostrated ourselves before the Host in prayer for a short time. There were thirty-five of us, and when the soldiers received orders to drive us out, thirty-four rose; the thirty-fifth lay dead before the Host. Her name was Rosalie Lanzecka; she was fifty-seven years old, and had been a nun thirty.

"When they had expelled us the orphans and our other pupils ran out crying. The inhabitants of the town joined them and attended us to our first halting-place, about a league off, where they stopped to tie us in couples and put irons on our hands and feet. The people were dispersed, and we had to proceed at a forced pace. They raised up such as fell and struck them. After seven days' march we reached Witebsk, where we were placed in a community of schismatic nuns (Czernice) who had been installed in the former Basilian convent six months before. . . .

"The Czernice had been brought from the Don, and were women of coarse habits, chiefly widows of soldiers who received a monthly allowance of seven rubles each from the Government. Our sisters, six months before, had been put into a single room situated in the stable yard, and obliged to discharge all the menial offices of the house. At the time of the suppression the community numbered eighteen, but before our arrival the abbess and four sisters had sunk under the hardships inflicted upon them. . . . The fetters which bound us in couples on the road

were removed and chains put on our feet, which we bore night and day for the whole seven years following. We were obliged to sweep the house, light the fires, and carry in water before six every morning, after which we were led to our hard labor, which varied according to the season. At first they made us break stones and draw them in barrows to which we were chained. At the end of two months the punishment of flogging began, twice a week, fifty lashes. We were flogged in the court-yard under an open shed, in the presence of the whole community, including the apostate priest Michalewicz, who had charge of us. What most affected us was, that we were beaten naked. The flogging over, we were led at once back to our hard work. After one of these floggings, Sister Columbia Gorska fainted on her way to work. She was revived by a heavy blow, and dragged herself to the barrow, but expired on attempting to move it. Another died from a blow on the head given her with a log of wood by the Superior of the Czernice. Two others, Susanah Rypinska and Coletta Sielawa, died after more floggings in 1839.

"In the end of 1840, two years after our arrival, soldiers arrived who placed irons on our hands and coupled us as before, and obliged us to set out, we were not told whither. After two days we arrived at Polock, where we were shut up in the former Basilian convent, now occupied by Czernice, under control of the Archpriest Wierovkin. We found there ten sisters, the remains of the community which had been composed of twenty-five members two years before. The Abbess Rozanska and fourteen others had perished in that time. Two of the survivors had become insane from blows on the head. One of them, Sister Filihauser, died shortly, the other, Teresa Bienecka, survived about six months. On returning to our prison one day we found her dead and bleeding.

"The Czernice of Polock treated us in the same way as those of Witebsk. We had more work under them. We suffered most when we were employed on the building of a house for Siemasko; we lost three sisters on it in eight days by accidents. Their names were Ilgocka, Siecieka and Landauska. During the same summer five were buried alive in an excavation they were making for potters' clay. Shortly after nine more perished; the wall on which they were at work gave way, and my nine sisters were buried under the ruins.

"In the fall of 1841 Siemasko arrived at Polock. On meeting us he expressed his satisfaction that we had relinquished our obstinacy, and were ready to accept the benefits of the orthodox religion. I asked him 'who had invited him to come again to tempt us.' 'Yourself,' he replied. 'What!' I exclaimed. 'Then it is your sisters,' he rejoined. 'Which of them?' All the sisters in-

dignantly cried out a denial, and turning to him I said, 'Apostate, we are, and by God's help always will be, ready to die for the faith as our sisters have died before us.' He went away blaspheming, after giving orders to have us flogged. We were scourged till dark, and the same night Sister Holynska died in my arms."

It is too revolting to continue the further account of these barbarities, which continued until the escape of the abbess and three other sisters in the spring of 1845. During a celebration the whole schismatic community got drunk for three days, and the four nuns resolved to attempt an escape. They removed their chains and climbed the wall of their prison during the last night of the feast. Outside of their prison they separated to give a better chance that one at least might be able to reveal to the world the true character of the conversion of the Uniat Catholics.

It is a difficult point to determine how far a century of persecution, such as has been described, has succeeded in rooting out the Catholic faith among its victims. Externally the Uniat Catholic Church has ceased to exist in Russia. Its hierarchy has been destroyed, its churches closed, its priests banished, and its members are officially enrolled in the schismatic State Church; but all this is no proof that the mass of the people are not still Catholic in will. The Russian Government rigorously prohibits any investigation into this point; but in spite of its vigilance, indications are not wanting that the mass of the population yet adheres to the Catholic Church. In 1860, the whole population of five villages deserted the schismatic worship, and thronged to the Catholic Latin churches near Mohilev, and the government found no other means of preventing them than that of closing all the neighboring Catholic churches. In 1858 the population of Dziernowice presented a petition to Alexander the Second, begging to be allowed to return to the faith of their ancestors.

The Senator Stcherbinin was specially sent by the Czar to suppress this religious movement, and in his official report he informed his imperial master that they remained inflexible to all exhortations, and declared that they would not belong to orthodoxy. The senator, by his own account, imprisoned the leaders at Witebsk, and announced to the people that they must remain in the orthodox church, under the severest penalties, after which he left the completion of their conversion to the police. Finally, after several months, the population was forced to the schismatic church and with that the Government appeared satisfied. Mr. Stcherbinin stated plainly in his report that the apostacy was on the point of assuming large proportions, and that it threatened already the dissolution of the union of 1839, by which the Uniat Catholics had been proclaimed schismatics. He added that the Uniat priests,

that had conformed to the State Church, had lost all public respect and were generally regarded as renegades, and that the Archbishop Siemasko himself had no better name. To prevent a renewal of the religious agitation, Stcherbinin proposed that for the future a special law should be enacted by which, in case a village or community should secede in mass from the State Church, all the heads of families in it should be sent to convents in Russia as prisoners, *to confirm them in the confession of the orthodox rite*. Alexander II. wrote in his own hand on the margin of the report: "Put it in execution if the case occurs."

The Schism evidently has not yet struck deep root in the hearts of the Uniats, though "reunited to it by love in 1839." There is every reason to believe that the sentiments of the people of Dziernowice are shared by the ten millions of their countrymen in Poland and Russia, who have been officially incorporated in the State Church, and that it only needs the establishment of religious freedom in the Russian empire to bring them back to the Church which they have never abandoned. The Jubilee of this year is like Diocletian's famous proclamation of the extinction of Christianity fifteen centuries ago, and is likely to be just as effectual in its results.

RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO HUMAN PROGRESS.

Geschichte der Päpste. Dr. Ludwig Pastor. Freiburg, 1886.

Gli Eretici d'Italia. Cesare Cantù, 5th Art. Torino, 1865.

THE question has been asked, since the celebration of our national centenary, whether the country has morally improved or gone backwards since the days of Washington, and the answer has been tintured by prejudice rather than prompted by a cold survey of the facts. On the whole, however, although the dyspeptics, the supercilious, and the disappointed in Church and State have tried to make us believe that we are rushing to decay, the general answer, based on a thorough criticism of the facts and a faithful comparison between our political and religious condition a hundred years ago and our present state, has been favorable to the view that we have advanced and improved politically, socially, and morally; and that there are no seriously threatening clouds in the horizon of the great republic. The question asked about it suggests a similar one about the great Church which is now the only conservative and historically loyal Christian body in the land. The breaking up of the state church systems, which sustained the Protestant sects in the old colonial times and even in the early days of our independence, has deprived them of all their external vigor; they have long ceased to be conservative, while the well-known toryism of the branch of the Church of England now known as Episcopalianism, debars it from consideration as a loyal factor in the formation of our republican institutions. It was English in the beginning recognizing George the Third as its lawful Pope, and it still hankers after the forms and liturgy of the "dear old land" with a suppressed sigh of regret for a revolution which cut the string that would have tied it still to the apron of the venerable and infallible head of the British empire and the English church. The Catholic Church alone in this land of liberty was always conservative, although never a state Church here, and always loyal, because not dependent in temporals on any foreign potentate.

The question, however, is not, has the Church retrograded in America? That could be easily answered and in the negative. Her progress here is simply phenomenal and reminds us of the boast of Tertullian in the first ages of Christianity—We are but of yesterday, yet we fill all the land. Our steeples rise in every town; every mountain and glen resounds with the song of monks chanting matins, or of nuns murmuring their orisons. We have driven

out the Puritan from his stronghold, not by force of arms, but by the law that the fittest shall survive. In the halls of justice and the haunts of commerce, the cross proudly holds its own. In the navy, the hand that steers the ship is often one that knows how to make the holy sign. In the army, Catholics have more than a tenth legion; and our starry flag has been borne victoriously on many a battle-field by men whose spiritual allegiance to the successor of St. Peter only made their allegiance to America and her political ideas of government the stronger. The barriers of prejudice have been broken down, and bigotry has retired to its gloomy cave, from which it sometimes snarls indeed, but only with teeth that cannot bite.

Nor is the question whether the Church as a divine institution, in her doctrines and sacraments, has retrograded. To ask such a question would be to imply doubt in the promises of her Divine Founder, in her divine origin, indefectibility and infallibility. Such a question, indeed, could be properly asked of some sect that takes its creed from an act of parliament, or from the will of the ruling civil dynasty, or the political form of government under which it lives; or of a sect that holds one code of doctrines and morals south of Mason and Dixon's line and another north of it; or of a sect that swore to one code of belief under Edward the Sixth, and to another under Elizabeth; or of a system of Christianity that periodically changes its Bible, and blots out of it passages unpalatable to popular taste and infidel clamor. But the Catholic Church never changes, because she is divine; she can neither diminish nor add to the code laid down for her by Jesus Christ, because she has not the power. She is limited to regulation, development, and legitimate evolution, and modifications consequent on them; but she can never create a creed. It were absurd, therefore, to ask if she has retrograded in any sense that would imply a change in her constitution, code of dogmas or ethics, or in any of the divine attributes that must remain immutable in her unto the end of time. Her Papacy is unchangeable, whether made glorious by a Hildebrand or disgraced by a Borgia; her episcopacy and apostolical succession remain intact, whether a Borromeo or a De Dominis wears the mitre, and her monastic asceticism endures, whether illuminated by a Benedict or dragged into the mire by the Saxon boar of the sixteenth century.

The question concerns, therefore, only the human side of the Church, and is asked from the standpoint of history alone. Judged by this external standard, is the Catholic Church to-day, in the exterior manifestation of zeal and piety, in her schools and universities, in her external discipline, in the condition of the clergy, in the purity of the sanctuary, in the appointment of bishops,

and in the loyalty of the laity and clergy to the chief pastor, better than she was at any other period since the great day of Pentecost ? It requires but very little knowledge of ecclesiastical history to be able to say at once that she is, and that there has been wonderful progress even on the human side of the holy Church. Some *laudator temporis acti* may deny it ; but the denial will not bear an analysis. At what period was the Church more free from scandals than she is in the reign of Leo XIII. ?

The days of the fathers ?

But were not those the days of loathsome heresies, of Simonians and Gnostics, of Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians and the rest ; days of the *lapsi* and the *libellatici* ; days when Christian mobs desecrated the churches of Alexandria, and false bishops fawned on Byzantine prefects and co-operated in all the infamies of the Lower Empire ; the days of the *Circumcellionés* in Africa, days of Novatian and Donatian schism, of anti-Popes and weak Popes like Liberius, Marcellus and Honorius ; days when disputes arose in the very college of the apostles. The inner history of those early ages will show a record of false brethren, apostacy and plotting as black as any in the history of Christendom. The Christian Roman emperors were more insidious persecutors of the Church than their pagan predecessors, because more dangerous to orthodoxy. The Council of Rimini, after which the whole world awoke and found itself Arian, shows the extremity of the peril as well as the success of Byzantine heresy and schism. The Pagan emperor killed only the body of the Christian ; the successors of Constantine not only killed the body of the Catholic, but tried to destroy his soul by perverting him to heresy ; and bishops like Eusebius, Acacius, Timothy Ailuros and Photius seconded the imperial purpose. The history of the great Athanasius shows a condition of malignant plotting by Christian prelates against the purity and integrity of the faith, not to be found at any other period of Church history. Certainly there is nothing like it in our times. It is true, those early ages had their Augustines and Athanasiuses ; but in the ages to come, men will not hesitate to rank in the same category with them our Newmans, Mannings, Hugheses and Kenricks. Not one of those early fathers fought better for the Church than the first Archbishop of New York ; the representative of our great republic in her hour of peril, both at home, in the presence of mobs, and abroad, at the court of emperors and even of the Pope himself. It is doubtful if any early father had an intellect superior to that of the great English convert, Cardinal Newman ; and our age has no Tertullian or Origen to disturb the peace of the Church by heresy or vain speculations. If we look beyond the pale of the English-speaking races, we find a whole galaxy of great Catholic writers,

Donoso Cortes, Görres, Ketteler, Hergenröther, Hefele and Janssen, Pie, Dupanloup, Montalembert and Lacordaire, whose talent and eloquence favorably compare with the writers of Alexandria and the court preachers of Constantinople. He who supposes that scandals did not abound in the early ages of the Church must have glanced very rapidly over their history. The Church in those days was not free. Imperial legislation and intrigue tied her hands. The foot of Cæsar was ever intruding in the sanctuary from the day that Constantine sat at the Council of Nice, till Zeno published his *Henoticon* and Michael III. sustained Photius in usurping the patriarchal office in Constantinople and refusing to recognize the supremacy of Rome. Fashionable women in Alexandria, with crosses marked on their flowing robes, frequented the chamber, not to pray, but to make conquests; and a courtesan sometimes became the spouse of the emperor and the dispenser of Church benefices. The poor were oppressed, and vice flourished from Antioch to Ravenna. There have been no such scandals in this age as existed in the days of the fathers.

If we pass to the period that immediately followed, then our contention that the Church has not retrograded is more clearly proven. No one will think of comparing the half-converted barbarians of the 6th, 7th and 8th centuries with modern Catholics. Those barbarians, whether Goths, Huns or Vandals, covered the old Roman and new Christian civilization with a lava of ignorance and vice. Here and there in the flood of desolation a monastic institution arose like a beacon, but the rest was all darkness and ruin. Those were the days when the Visigoths ravaged Spain and the Huns poured over the Alps into the fertile plains of Italy; when Theodoric and his Arians took Ravenna and persecuted the Catholics; when Astolphus with his Lombards compelled Pope Stephen II. to leave Rome and seek shelter in France; when the pagan Saracens murdered Catholics in Europe while the royal Sapor martyred them in Persia. Where was then peace for the Church? Where was then her culture or her schools? These were times when kings, even the Frankish kings, were as licentious as Heliogabalus; when the kings that ruled even "the eldest daughter of the Church" were little better than the pagan Brennus, who led the Gauls to Rome in the days before Christianity. What was the condition of court and sanctuary, of noble and bishop, among the converted barbarians, whom Columbanus and his missionaries undertook to reform in the 6th and 7th centuries? Ozanam and Montalembert paint the dark picture: priests ignorant of Latin; bishops living in open concubinage, having nothing of the sacred character but the name and a mitre; kings and queens leading openly scandalous lives. Against them, against Brunehilda and

Thierry, and Clotaire, and Fredegonda, and their corrupt courts the brave Irishman thundered in vain; the darkness grew deeper and deeper, and the human element in the Church seemed to prevail over the divine. Surely, no one will say that the Church in the 9th century, the age of iron, or in the 10th century, the age of lead, was in a better condition than in the 19th. Even the court of the great Charles was no model. Nor was he one himself. His attempt to educate his empire was buried with him, and his degenerate sons undid all his work. The very "capitulars" of his councils show between the lines, and often in the very letter of the code, a deplorable condition of public morals. Centuries that show the Papacy itself dominated by a Marozia and a Theodora cannot certainly be compared to ours.

It is true that the law of induction, which holds good in physical science, cannot be applied to history. History shows the action of free will under Divine providence. It is a moral science, not one governed by physical and necessary laws. Hence, it is full of anomalies and contradictions. Great crimes and great virtues are found in the same individual and on the same page. Flashes of light appear in the midst of the darkest gloom. The sun is ever shining, though the fog be as thick as that which so frequently hangs over the modern Babylon. The sun of Christianity, the divine effulgence of the Church, never sets. A sweeping assertion, therefore, or a general conclusion, can seldom be drawn from any number of historical facts. The events of history are the actions of free agents. The 9th and 10th centuries were not all dark; but our contention is that they were far darker than the darkest period in our own. The very penal code of the Church in those days attests it.

But what of the 11th and the 12th and the others up to the "Reformation"—the so much vaunted period of the Middle Ages, the ages of the Crusades, modern inventions and Gothic cathedrals? Even they had their scandals, greater than ours. It is true that Hildebrand in the 11th century lifted the clergy out of the mire into which feudalism and imperial intrusions in the sanctuary had cast them. The great Pope had found the sanctuary turned into an Augean stable, but, like another Hercules, he strove to purify it. Yet he did not altogether succeed. His own people drove him out of Rome after he had captured it from a Catholic emperor and Catholic soldiers, by the aid of Normans and Saracens. He died in exile. His able successors were engaged in one continuous struggle with the Holy Roman emperors, and their most Christian majesties of every Catholic land, up to the days of Luther; excommunicating and interdicting Henrys and Othos in Germany, Philips in France, and Henrys, Edwards and Johns in England. Anti-Popes abounded, sometimes two and three at a time. The so-called

Catholic barons were robbers who plundered both the Church and the poor, and bishops lived in indolence and luxury, knowing how to fly a falcon better than to administer the sacraments. The Franciscans did much to reform the clergy; the Dominicans did a great deal to teach the ignorant laity and keep them out of the Albigensian heresy, which had only become possible through the gross indifference of the clergy to the welfare of their flocks. The Middle Ages were a period of great virtue and intellect, but they were also a period of extraordinary crimes and real ignorance. The Popes of that period were worse treated by Catholic kings than they have ever been by heretical monarchs. The men who maltreated Boniface VIII. at Anagni, did not belong to the 19th century and were not Protestants. Philip the Fair ruled France in the good old Catholic times before the "Reformation." Sciarra Colonna, the king's agent, who sacrilegiously dragged Boniface from his throne, was an Italian prince, who would have burnt Luther alive; and Dante, whose venomous hate has condemned Boniface and others of the Popes to hell, was the great Catholic poet of the "ages of faith." Yes, "ages of faith" they were, but sometimes ages of nothing else. The Crusaders often behaved worse than the Moslem. The morals of the Eastern Christians were, perhaps, worse than those of the Turk. Then came the days of the great schism of the West, when Christians did not know where to look for unity or for the supreme head of the Church. They were days of Arnold of Brescia and Rienzi, of the Colonnas—and Sforzas, who hated the Popes and treated them worse than even Garibaldi or Crispi. They were the days of dungeons and torture, of serfdom and slavery, of oppression of the poor by royal and baronial despots, as well as the ages of the great cathedrals and Thomas Aquinas.

Perhaps the 15th century and beginning of the 16th was the most scandalous period in the whole history of the Church. They could not plead ignorance as an excuse for vice, as could the 9th and 10th centuries. The revival of letters had illuminated Europe after the schism of the West. Reuchlin, Hutten and Erasmus were the product of German culture just before Luther, and the court of Alexander VI. and of Leo X. had renowned scholars; yet to what a deplorable condition had sunk the secular and the regular clergy is shown by the cardinals who conspired to poison Leo X., and the Papacy dishonored by the vices of a Borgia. We do not take our opinion of that age from the statements of a satirist like Hutten any more than we do that of the 14th century from a novelist like Boccaccio; nor even from almost impartial Protestant historians like Gregorovius and Ranke. Lingard, Cantù, Pastor, Janssen and Alvisi, orthodox Catholics who are not afraid to tell the truth, precisely because they are Catholics, will be our

witnesses. "The chief of the German bishops," says Lingard, describing the condition of the Church in those times, "were at the same time secular princes; and as they had been promoted more on account of their birth than their merit, they frequently seemed to merge their spiritual in their temporal character; hence they neglected the episcopal functions; the clergy, almost free from restraint, became illiterate and immoral; and the people, ceasing to respect those whom they could not esteem, inveighed against the riches of the Church."¹ The same was true of every country in Europe as well as of Germany. The insurrectionary movement against the Church in England at the end of the 14th century, continued through the 15th, and prepared the way for Henry VIII. and his confiscating parliaments. Wyclif and the Lollards began by attacking the excessive wealth of the clergy and ended by assailing the doctrines of the Church. Richard the Second's parliament, in A.D. 1390, enacted a law to prevent the Pope from nominating to vacant Church benefices in England, and that "whoever should bring or send into England any Papal sentence or excommunication against any person for the execution of this statute should, besides forfeiture, incur the penalty of life and limb."² In Scotland the illegitimate sons of the nobility were appointed to the vacant abbacies and bishoprics; and the same was done in France and Germany by the canonical patron, whether lay baron, king, or emperor. Men who in this country complain that the inferior clergy are not sufficiently represented in the election of bishops, should read the history of the last few centuries to see how the Popes were often morally compelled by secular influence to accept unworthy candidates or leave the sees in widowhood. Our bishops now make our bishops; but it is not so long ago that they were made in Europe by the courtier who had most influence with the throne, or by a Protestant or a Hebrew prime minister of some royal majesty, Catholic in name and Mohammedan in conduct.

In Italy the scandals were worse than elsewhere. Of the Popes of the Renaissance up to the "Reformation," few were entirely worthy of being the successors of St. Peter and the vicars of Christ. The great Alexander VI., great as an administrator and organizer, was immoral, even after he had donned the tiara, and the scandals of his reign recall the evil days of Marozia and Theodora. Eneas Sylvius, afterwards Pope Pius II., bitterly describes and attacks the parasites and simoniacs surrounding the Popes.³ His words are almost too severe to quote.

History of England, vol. vi., p. 98 (Dolman, London, 1851).

² *Idem*, vol. iv., p. 226.

³ *Epist.* lib. i., c. 66.

St. Catherine of Siena wrote to her confessor: "Three perverse vices reign in the spouse of Christ; that is, in the prelates who are intent on nothing but delights and very great riches."¹ John de Medici, who was afterwards Leo X., when only a boy was a canon of the cathedrals of Florence, Fiesole and Arezzo; rector of Carmignano, of Giogli, of San Casciano, of St. John in Valdarno, of San Pier di Casale, of San Marcellino di Cacchiano; prior of Montevarchi; chanter of Saint Antonio of Florence; provost of Prato; abbot of Monte Cassino, of Saint John of Passignano, of Miransu in Valdarno, of St. Mary of Morimondo, of Saint Martin of Fontedoleo, of San Salvatore of Vajano, of San Bartolomeo d'Anghiari, of Saint Lawrence of Coltibuono, of Saint Mary of Montepiano, of Saint Julian of Tours, of Saint Just and Saint Clement of Volterra, of Saint Stephen of Bologna, of Saint Michael of Arezzo, of Chiaravalle near Milan, of Pin in Poitou (France), and of Chaise-Dieu, near Clermont (France). A boy cleric owning thirty-two fat benefices at the same time! His nephew, Cardinal Innocent Cibo, held, at the same time, eight bishoprics, four archbishoprics, the legations of Romagna and of Bologna, the abbacies of Saint Victor at Marseilles, and of Saint Ouen at Rouen. Cardinal Hypolite of Este, at the age of seven, was primate of Hungary, bishop of Modena, Novara, Narbonne, and archbishop of Capua and of Milan.² These are only a few instances of the scandalous pluralism of the 16th century. The inferior clergy were no better than their superiors. Hear again Cantù: "They said Mass with mechanical indifference from mere habit, like any ordinary ceremony, without spirit or unction, without knowing how the ceremonies were historically connected with those of the early Church. Many had the title of Doctor in Theology, but knew no theology; and, as even now, neither serious nor profound books are read, but encyclopædias, newspapers and compendiums, so, then, instead of Fathers and the Holy Scriptures, there were 'Summas,' 'Flowers,' and 'Manuals.' Innocent VIII. was obliged to renew the constitution of Pius II., which forbade priests to keep butcher-shops or taverns."³

Cantù again describes the vices of his countrymen before and during the "Reformation": "The prelates preserved under the clerical frock the habits of their secular education and unbridled luxury. We need no other proof of this than the third Council of Lateran, which, warning the prelates that it was unbecoming in them to keep so many retainers, and to consume in one banquet the annual income of the church which they visited, wishes the cardinals to

¹ Apud Cantù, *Gli eretici d'Italia*, vol. i., p. 212.

² *Idem*, p. 202.

³ *Eretici d'Italia*, vol. i., p. 203.

be content with forty or fifty carriages, the archbishops with thirty or forty, the bishops with twenty-five, archdeacons with five or seven, deans with two horses; and forbids all of them to own race-horses or hunting hawks. Sometimes forty and even fifty benefices were held by one cleric. . . . Negligent pastors, who had never even seen their flocks, they exercised an insolent jurisdiction over them. Among the inferior clergy reigned ignorance, traffic in the sacraments, drunkenness and shameful disorders; in the churches and monasteries were often found taverns and gambling hells."¹ If this were a Protestant writer, we should feel like accusing him of overdrawing the picture; but coming from the great Catholic Italian, we cannot question his testimony, and the more we examine it, the more we find that the facts justify it.²

If from sunny Italy we turn our eyes northward to foggy Caledonia, we find the condition of the Church no better. Hear the impartial Lingard: "Of all the European churches, there was, perhaps, not one better prepared to receive the seed of the new gospel than that of Scotland. During a long course of years the highest dignities had, with few exceptions, been possessed by the illegitimate or younger sons of the most powerful families, men who, without learning or morality themselves, paid little attention to the learning or morality of their inferiors. The pride of the clergy, their negligence in the discharge of their functions, and the rigor with which they exacted their dues, had become favorite subjects of popular censure; and when the new preachers appeared, they dexterously availed themselves of the humor of the time, and seasoned their discourses against the doctrines with invectives against the vices of the churchmen."³ The Scottish king, James V., provided for his illegitimate children by making them abbots and priors of Holyrood House, Kelso, Melrose, Coldingham, and Saint Andrews.⁴ How was it in Germany?

John Butzbach, a German Catholic writer of those times, quoted by Janssen, thus describes the higher clergy: "You see red-faced prelates, clothed in the finest English cloth, and their hands decked with the most costly jewels; jewels on their necks or ostentatiously fastened on their dress. They ride proudly on horseback, followed by troops of fantastically dressed servants. They build fine houses with high, richly decorated walls; and they revel at gorgeous banquets, in which they squander the property of the Church, or they

¹ *Storia d'Italia*, vol. vi., pp. 344, 345.

² Even ever faithful Ireland did not escape from the all-pervading scandals. Henry II. imported from England the vices of the Norman clergy, of whom St. Lawrence O'Toole sent at one time 150 specimens to Rome to show the Pope the kind of men who were sent to "reform" the Irish Church. The Archbishopric of Armagh was held as the apanage of one family for 100 years.

³ *History of England*, vol. vii., p. 269.

⁴ *Idem*.

lavish the money of the Church in fast horses, dogs and falcons. . . . Each tries to surpass the other in extravagance and luxury."¹

Undoubtedly, these are only the shadows on the picture, but are they not darker than any we can find in our age? Have we not improved even since the days of Louis XV. and the despicable race of the *Abbes de Cour*, or even since the days of Napoleon I., who could have found among the French prelates of his time the material for an anti-Pope; or since the days of Joseph II., who stocked the seminaries of the Austrian empire with text-books of theology condemned at Rome? There was, undoubtedly, much brightness in the 15th century in the landscape of the Church, and there was more of it away from Italy than in it. In Germany, the Catholic reformation, inaugurated by Cardinal Nicholas von Cues, in the middle of the 15th century, produced glorious fruits. "It was an age of widening and far-reaching spiritual improvement among all classes of the people (in Germany), of learned and artistic activity, of wonderful energy. Zealous effort was made to improve the morals and religious life of the people by catechetical instruction, preaching, translations of the Bible, books of instruction and devotion of various kinds. A strong foundation for the education of the masses was laid in the primary and learned middle schools. The universities flourished better than before, and became the foci of spiritual development. And more even than science, art was developed according to religious and popular principles. It surrounded ecclesiastical, public and domestic life with most noble monuments. It showed the deep Christian feeling of German life and character."² Cantù also qualifies in many places his dark descriptions of the condition of the Church in pre-"Reformation" times; but his facts cannot be gainsaid, and they prove that the Church of the 19th century is not in a state of retrogression.

She is now comparatively free; free in the British Isles, free where the Moslem rules, free in the old empire where Kaunitz and Joseph once oppressed her, free in the domain of Bismarck, who never persecuted her as the emperors of the Holy Roman Empire did; and she is less persecuted in Italy than she was in the days of Rienzi or Sciarra Colonna. The chains of feudalism and of feudal patronage have been stricken from her holy hands. The bulls against simony, and the constitutions of Canon Law against simoniacs now read like ancient history. The pluralism and schisms of the Middle Ages have gone. Christian liberty walks abroad over the earth. Christian schools everywhere flourish. In spite of local persecution, Christian colleges abound. The Church may not be strong in temporals; but she is spiritually stronger. Her

¹ Janssen's *Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes*, vol. i., p. 601.

² *Idem*, p. 594.

missionary priests are in every pagan land. There is not a scandal in the sanctuary. There is not even a Darboy in the Church of France. Gallicanism is dead. The race of the Kettlers and Droste von Vischerings has lifted up the German Church. There is now union. The infallible head is universally respected. The prelacy is pure; the priesthood is zealous, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them. There are now no Don Abbondios even in the Church of Italy; and the neglected peasantry of that classic land are becoming better educated and better Christians. In looking at this bright picture, it is pleasant to see that the American Church is the brightest spot in it. After one hundred years of life, beginning in beggary and weakness, unaided by king or kaiser, unprotected by feudal baron, undowered by any aristocracy, without help save from the all-powerful arm of the Most High, she has peopled the land with millions of spiritual children; she has instructed the minds and reformed the morals of immigrants whom centuries of religion under the old regimes had left almost barbarous and entirely ignorant; she has built houses to God and homes for the sick and helpless, schools and colleges for the ignorant, and is building a university for the learned, without a penny of State aid. She is, in this land, no satrap tied by purple strings to the feet of a throne. No concordat, wrung from her by an infidel politician, hampers her action. She stands erect, instinct with the freedom of Jesus Christ; free with the air of American liberty, and holy because she is free; united to her spiritual head with a passionate love, because she is free. The natural tendency of every free Church is to be united to the mother and mistress of all. Only when the politicians tie her down, is this natural tendency held in check. A free Church gives a free field for the faith and love of Jesus Christ, and such a Church will ever be true to Rome, the centre of Christian faith and charity. You may steal the young bird, and imprison it in the cage; but if you open the door of its prison, it will fly at once to the mother that calls to it from the nest. If not, it will break its pinions against the bars and die, unless you remove it from the sound of the parent's voice. So has it been with every national church separated by force from Rome. We fear no separation here, because Americans do not believe in mediæval dungeons, or in national church cages made by kings, kaisers, or politicians.

In seeking for the causes of this improvement in the external life of the Church, three or four seem to be the most prominent. They are, firstly, the lifting up of the laity in the social scale; secondly, the establishment of seminaries by the Council of Trent; and thirdly, the gradual destruction of feudal rights in the conferring of Church benefices.

The great democrat of the 11th century, Hildebrand, who, as

soon as he assumed the reins of pontifical authority, dispensed the laity from their allegiance to concubinary and simoniacal priests and bishops, began the reformation which culminated in the Council of Trent. He taught the laity to distinguish between the office and the man; he lifted them up from their prostrate position on the church floor, and taught them to approach the sanctuary rails and explore the sacristy and the parsonage; he made them teach the teachers, and compel their spiritual guides to live up to their own teaching. Other great Popes, like Innocent III., continued the tradition begun by Gregory, until at last the common people, who had for ages been only serfs in the Church, became free, and their liberation and the restoration of their manhood in the Church was the prelude to their independence in the State. They demanded, under the incitement of the pontiffs, that their priests and bishops should be worthy; and then proceeded to limit the power of the plundering baron and the despotic king who had given them unworthy prelates. The bright light of lay criticism on the clergy, although sometimes pushed to extremes, as in the satires of the 16th century, undoubtedly had much influence in effecting an improvement in the morals and manners of churchmen. The spread of learning among the laity developed their intelligence and made them critical. They knew the ideals of priestly life, and they found fault with the realities thrust upon them. The clergy soon saw that the days when a bishop might be the keeper of a kennel, or when a parish priest could be a rollicking fox-hunter instead of the pastor of a Christian flock, had passed away forever. Where such a cleric governed, the people would not go to Mass, nor pay tithes, nor frequent the sacraments, until a worthier incumbent was obtained to lead their souls to heaven by word and example, as well as by his office.

Although previous to the Council of Trent there were separate schools for the education of the clergy, which can be traced back to the 6th century,¹ yet they were imperfect compared to those which began to flourish after the Tridentine decree, ordering the establishment of diocesan seminaries for the exclusive training of the priesthood. The old ecclesiastical schools were often mixed; the lay and the cleric studying together and sharing the same sports. After Trent, pious and intelligent boys of twelve years of age—the children of poor parents preferred²—were secluded in special schools, separated from contamination with the profane, clothed in ecclesiastical attire, placed under holy guides whose duty it was to train them up to be model priests. The vocation of these boys

¹ There is a decree of the Council of Toledo, A.D. 531, quoted by Craisson (*Jus Canonicum*, vol. i., p. 505), which foreshadows that of the Council of Trent.

² "*Pauperum autem filios præcipue eligi vult.*"

was fostered and sheltered from the temptations of the world. They became a caste apart, a learned body of ascetics, educated to lead the laity in spiritual things, and ever to remember the dignity of their rank and calling without violating the spirit of Christian humility. As the diocesan seminary, small or great, flourished, so did the Church progress in reform. The diminution of scandals kept pace with the spread of those institutions of ecclesiastical learning and piety. The missionary spirit was revived. In France particularly, in the early part of the 17th century, a holy French priest named Olier founded the great seminary of St. Sulpice at Paris, and the congregation of priests that bears its name, and thus laid the foundation of the glory of the modern French Church. St. Sulpice was the centre of renovation in France. The bishops begged the Sulpicians to establish in their dioceses branches of the congregation. The fame of the Sulpicians for learning as well as piety went into every land, and to-day their seminaries, wherever established, are the models of the world.

But perhaps of all the causes that have brought about improvement in the external condition of the Church, the destruction of feudal patronage in the conferring of benefices is the most efficacious. For this, too, we are indebted, first of all, to Hildebrand and the great Popes who succeeded him, Innocent III., Alexander III. and Boniface VIII. By a constitution of Alexander II., whose reign was dominated by the genius of Hildebrand, "no bishop in the Church was permitted to exercise his functions until he had received the confirmation of the Holy See!"¹ This broke the power of the kings over episcopal nominations. The king, of course, still continued to usurp, the lay baron to appoint; but unless granted by special favor, or concordat, the pontiffs never relaxed the ordinance of Alexander. The canon law, which is chiefly but a collection of pontifical acts, bristles with bulls of excommunication against lay intrusion, usurping patrons and simoniacs. When men like Fra Paolo Sarpi find fault with the Church for possessing at one time enormous wealth, and reproach her with the shameless barter that frequently took place in her benefices, they forget that probably the severest portion of her modern penal code is that which condemns pluralism² and simony. The latter is held to be one of the greatest of crimes, and next to heresy. The canon law calls it "*simoniacam hæresim*," and pursues the buyer or the seller of benefices with canonical censures which cannot be avoided by any trick or device of the contracting parties. The punishment of the abuse of patronage, although not so great as that of simony, was still sufficiently severe to protect

¹ Hallam, *Middle Ages*, p. 285.

² Council Trid., Sess. 24, c. 17 de reform.

the Church. If the ecclesiastical patron presented an unworthy candidate, he lost the right of presentation; and if the lay patron abused his power, the presentation was declared to be null and void. The great revolutions of Europe, in which the State confiscated the Church property, while doing enormous harm, were also the occasions of much good. God knows how to make good come out of evil, and from the chaos which the infidel revolutions had made there emerged a purer clergy and a more united laity. Benefices disappeared and the poor suffered; but the number of ambitious or avaricious intruders into the sanctuary grew less; kings and barons were beheaded, and the mob drank their blood in drunken frenzy, while fearful disorders reigned in the State, but in their taking off the Church was freed from the sham protectors who had sold the crozier and the mitre to the highest bidder, and filled the sanctuary with the litter of the royal or baronial stye. Those days are dead, and peace to their ashes. Certainly no American Catholic sighs for their return. Contemplating the centenary of his own State-unprotected and State-unaided Church, beholding her splendid progress without fat benefices or aristocratic livings to attract her clergy, witnessing the zeal, the generosity and the piety of her laity, and, above all, conscious of her loyalty to Rome and the Holy Father, while he sees landing on our shores wretched, ignorant, irreligious emigrants from countries blessed with State churches and centuries of ecclesiastical wealth, he is content with his lot as a freeman and an ever-progressive son of the Holy Church. He sees the improvement on the feudal past, and it will not be his fault if there is any step backward. His motto is: "*Nullum vestigium retrorsum.*"

THE RELATIVITY OF OUR KNOWLEDGE.

THAT all our knowledge is relative can be asserted in a sense in which it is quite indisputable. Viewed as *our* knowledge, and not as the knowledge of another, it is relative to us; but so is the omniscience of God relative to Him, or in the same sense subjective. The relativity or subjectivity of knowledge means, however, in modern language, quite a different thing. It means that all our impressions, whether from without or within, are so modified by the channels through which they come, or by the mind on which they are received, that they convey no real knowledge of that which originated them, or even of the existence of any object to originate them; in a word, that our *knowledge* is only that "it seems to us so." But this miserable illusion, neither mind nor matter, but a sort of chemical compound, to which both contribute, cannot be called knowledge at all, having no type in reality. Knowledge is the certainty of that which *is*. Mental impressions which do not correspond with any type, spiritual or material, are mere hallucinations. To constitute knowledge, three things are *indispensable*. First, that the fact should be as conceived; second, that the conviction as to it should be absolutely free from doubt; and, third, that this conviction should include the necessity of the fact, either *à priori* or *à posteriori*—that *now*, at least, it *cannot* be otherwise. Without these conditions there may be a very strong and practical belief, but no knowledge. If mental impressions which correspond to no type can be called "relative knowledge," then, in the case of the phenomenon called "seeing double," the patient has "subjective knowledge" of double the number of lights which any one else can discern. That this is disease, is no reply, because the sober man is, by this supposition, also under a deception, only a different one, at every moment of his life.

If our knowledge of matter is only relative, the number of persons who view it alike cannot make their view true, any more than the great number of Moslems can make the Koran a divine book. But the Relativists are, to a certain extent, consistent. Many of them (we do not say all, for in most schools there are those who do not understand their own professed doctrines) would say that, to the Mahometan, the Koran is, to all intents, the Bible, because he thinks it to be divinely inspired. But, in another case, the Relativist would be found inconsistent. For, should another man appear ever so firmly convinced that the property of the Rela-

tivist belonged. to himself, the former would make no allowance whatever for "relative knowledge." We had once ourselves "subjective knowledge" of a living man being cut through the middle with a sword by another man, without suffering any injury. We saw it just as distinctly as we see the paper on which we write. Was that impression to be called knowledge, relative or subjective, or of any sort?

"Relative knowledge" and "subjective knowledge" are merely pompous names for *blind ignorance*, within the sphere of which nothing stable or obligatory could ever be established, political, social, moral or religious. If all that we can say is that the object is transformed out of its reality in the process of being thought or perceived by us; if we cannot tell what allowances to make, cannot in any way correct the impression back to *actual truth*, our knowledge is *nil*. All is guesswork. The case is quite different where we have the means of correcting the error, as we do continually in matters of size and distance. The position assigned to man by the Relativist is that of knowing that his impressions from the outer world are deceptive, while he has no means of determining in what ways, or to what extent, they are deceptive. But how have they ascertained the first part of this proposition? How do they know that our impressions of the scene around us, of the *non ego* in general, are not strictly correct, as far as they pretend to go? The second part of the proposition devours the first. If we have no way of correcting our impressions, then it is impossible to *prove* them erroneous, because this can really be done only by comparing them with an objective standard, and we have none other than they afford us.

The whole theory, then, is a gratuitous assumption, impossible to prove, and wholly unnecessary to assume as a hypothesis to explain anything else. It can never explain anything, because it throws a mist of confusion over everything. As an assumption, it is about as rational as if we were to doubt the reality of the scene before us, because we cannot see around the corner of the street, or to doubt the existence of the house we look at because we do not know what is going on inside. If the "testimony of the senses" is carefully examined, taking each sense by itself, it will be found that their report is connected with nothing that is not either *certainly true*, as our *inward sensation*, or *perfectly possible*, as a state of actualities outside.

If we affirm that the whole account of the external world which we have from our faculties, of its shapes, its colors, its textures, all that we call "the qualities of matter," is correct and true; that the changes we note take place historically in space and time; and this, because we are gifted with a power of *directly capturing*

facts within a certain range, while innumerable other facts escape because we have not the gift to detect *them*, how can the Relativist shake that position? He can turn upon us a volley of authors' names, which only amount to saying that our opinion is "unfashionable." This we already knew. But fashions change in philosophy as in other things, especially when a great genius, with powers of abstraction bordering on insanity, has infected a generation or two with speculations which neither he nor any other man ever perfectly understood, a fatal test of *this* being the power to translate and reproduce them *out of all* the technical phraseology of their author. What cannot be so paraphrased is not *philosophy*, for it is not *thought*. It is a fabric of words, not of ideas, and such, for the most part, is the "philosophy" of Kant.

If we affirm that what we perceive is that which is, and that consequently while a change in our faculties might certainly enable us to affirm much more than we can now affirm, no change can enable us to deny any part of what we now affirm; if we take up this position, that mind, of itself, *directly* and *correctly*, discerns matter and its qualities, giving it thereby a second true existence, that this power has been limited, in other spirits we know not how, or how far, but in ourselves, at least, by the union with the body, so that we can only see the outside of many objects, and not the interior—the nearest side and not the remote (as the microscope, the telescope, the metaphone, extend the range of our perception, but *unteach* us nothing that we should rationally have affirmed before using them)—in fine, that our channels of perception *distort* nothing, but are simply limited in range, what can an opponent reply? He can only call on us to *prove our view*; to which we rejoin, that we know our position in the argument much better than to give ourselves any such trouble. We leave the *onus probandi*, the whole task of proving his case, where nature and reason have placed it, on him who *impeaches both*. The *prima facie* view of the question is on our side; the conviction of the whole human race is on our side; and reason is on our side, because, on the relative hypothesis, the moral sense which we find within us has no real acts to determine upon, our desire of knowledge exists only as a craving for what nature has made utterly unattainable. Further, there is no certainty for any mind that the human race ever existed, or anything representing it, beside the private dream of that one mind. If there be, anywhere, another "*thought-man*," his dream is probably quite independent of ours.

The contradictions in these theories are innumerable, but some are more striking than others. The philosopher is to spend his life in the pursuit of knowledge, to find out for others that there never was, for man, any such thing. His successors in wisdom

are to start from the point attained by him, and seek knowledge, knowing from *the outset* that there was none to be found. Then we are told that the pursuit of knowledge is one of the things which honorably distinguish man from the brute! But who ever heard of a brute being such a fool as to spend its time looking for anything in a place where it certainly knew that thing was never to be found? If we saw a fox-hound all alone in a flagged yard, hunting up and down in full cry, until he was tired, and then going through a show of killing an invisible fox in a corner where there was nothing but *himself*, we should see the exact parallel of the philosopher in pursuit of "subjective knowledge," in a form of absurdity of which no brute was ever guilty.

Subjective knowledge can become *knowledge* at all only by allowing for, that is, *removing*, the effects of the subjectivity, and so releasing the reality. But this, by the nature of the case, is impossible. Therefore on this theory we have no knowledge. Consequently, the infant who spends his time sucking his own thumb is another exact type of the relativist philosopher, except that the infant has this intellectual advantage, that *he* did not know, *when he began*, that there was no nutriment to be obtained from that source, whereas the relativist proclaims at the outset the inanity of his own pursuit.

Our *knowledge* is altogether objective, because its objects are universal ideas, existing from eternity in the Divine Mind, and imparted to each of us with our living soul. We trace them in all that surrounds us, because they are there in a certain sense, all things having been formed on them. They are the same to all minds, and consequently independent of each. This view, a very ancient one, may be confirmed even by an experiment. Let any man undertake to convey to another a complete idea of thirst, of his person, character, abilities, history, prospects, and let him do so *exhaustively*, and at the end he will have used (except a few proper names) nothing but *universal terms*. When, of the idea, nothing remains unconveyed, nothing will have gone out but universals. Of what, then, did the man, as an object, consist at first? The result is the same if we attempt to convey exhaustively the idea of any other sensible thing. As an object to the mind, it consists of an aggregate of universal ideas combined in a particular form. The universals are certain, they *may* be all that is; we *instinctively* believe in the particular form, a sort of *residuum*, and although certainty on this point is not attainable, there exists not a shadow of a reason for doubt.

The great question is—can we change our perception of nature with anything more than a *suppressio veri*? No. Can we change it with a *suggestio falsi*? We answer, no, again. All theories in

which "Representation" is an essential part owe this notion chiefly to the consideration of the sense of sight, in which an image is actually presented on the retina.

The sensation of heat could never give the idea of *representation*. In any practical sense "Representation" must involve a "*tertium quid*," call it what we may. If this be either spirit or matter, it cannot bridge over the gulf between them, but must ever remain at one side. If it be neither, it only makes two gulfs of one. If it be both, it is a contradiction.

From this point of view, Descartes, Leibnitz, and Berkeley are really together, in that they all accept the testimony of the senses as that of God. "Representation" is not a *vital* part of any theory which does not comprise a "*tertium quid*" *misrepresenting* reality. A *tertium quid* in one sense is a necessity. When we think of a horse, we neither become a horse nor does our mind become a stable, else we should have stolen every horse we thought of. "Representation" is therefore only worth discussing as *misrepresentation*—in which sense it had no place with those great men. The maxim of Protagoras, "man is the measure of all things," is adopted by Bacon in terms that seem to countenance the doctrine of the relativity of knowledge. But, in the first place, he does not call any illusion or misconception by the name of knowledge; he only speaks of our impressions. He says: "*Omnes perceptiones, tam sensus quam mentis, sunt ex analogiâ nominis, non ex analogiâ universi, estque intellectus humanus instar speculi inequalis ad radios rerum, qui suam naturam naturâ rerum immiscet, eamque distorquit et inficit.*" That such is the necessary and universal character of the human intellect is simply false, and the assertion is scarcely consistent even with a belief in such a first cause as a "fortuitous concourse of atoms." But if Bacon meant more than to say that man is very liable to deceive himself, and form erroneous judgments; if he meant that by his constitution he *must* do so, he explodes his own doctrine, by describing and warning men against the "idola." By what process applied to a crooked mirror could the distorted image be brought back to its proper form? Or how could the misrepresentation be got rid of, except by independent knowledge of the object? Either, then, the obliquity is contingent, and particular, however common, or his precepts are absurd. The relativist theory makes the human mind a naturally or originally distorted mirror, the production necessarily of confusion and error irremediable concerning all that surrounds him. The idea before the mind of Bacon was not that of a mendacious faculty of perception—but that of a judgment warped by prejudice.

Relativists, when they admit a God, say that He made a system, and present to us a false representation of that system, concerning

which phantom we are intended to believe that it is not to be relied on, while as to the degree or manner of its distortion of the truth we are to be unable to determine anything; and that He inspired us with an ardent desire for knowledge, after having deliberately made knowledge for us unattainable. The *darkness* which has been spread over this subject as a study by all these writers, from the great German star to the smallest North and South British candles, is the inevitable result of obstinate impatience under an unalterable and self-evident decree of nature, viz., that no created being, no being not self-existent, can be capable of comprehending its own whole nature. We can make the body an object to the mind, and learn much of its structure and adaptations. We can also make some of the functions of the mind an object for others, and learn their relations. But when we seek to determine the relation of mind and body, or how the *non ego*, either in the body or beyond it, becomes into *ego*, thought, we ask the question: "What is man?" We seem to understand our whole nature, an undertaking *ab initio*, and in itself impossible to carry out. The result is more or less of a catastrophe—according to the more or less of our presumption. What splendid minds have not only failed in this pursuit, but in the course of it been occasionally *paralyzed*, so as not to see at all what is evident to minds much inferior! This vain pursuit, when taken up by superior minds, begins with keen analysis, then proceeds to ghastly abstractions; words are abundant, but meaning becomes more and more scarce, because the author has launched into the pursuit of the essentially unattainable, the knowledge of how any object or phenomenon (the name is unimportant) acts on minds, or is received by it, in other words, *what thought is*. That God knows the answer to this question, we can infer by what logicians call *subalternation*. As He knows all things, He must know this. That He could reveal it perfectly to a creature, or that any creature knows it except in a degree better than man, is repugnant to reason. If the philosopher wants a result, he must start from the truth. That mind, by the divine gift of its nature, *directly* transforms or translates all things within its range into knowledge; *that mind, in perceiving, does not act on matter any more than the telescope acts on the object; nor matter on mind, in perceiving, any more than the target acts on the gun.*

All other theories are bad attempts to bridge over the gulf between mind and matter, with strings of metaphysical words, which never take hold on both sides. When the bridge is fastened intelligibly to matter, it flutters in the wind without touching mind; when it is secured intelligibly on the side of mind, it flutters in the wind without laying hold upon matter.

Many persons who still believe something are learning to accept the proposition, without perceiving the consequences, that all our knowledge is "relative" or "subjective"; that it is an imaginary and mutable compound, or, rather, confusion of mind and matter. They are brought to this by a sort of terrorism exercised by shallow writers, who quote great names and use new and hard words. We would have them seriously consider what, on this theory, becomes, not only of all dogmatic belief, but of all human history. Our own "subjective knowledge" of to-day is a poor enough reliance, but what comes to us through a hundred or two hundred or a score of generations of imagining "subjects" (even if any such persons ever existed, which is, on this theory, quite doubtful), should be too *ethereal* to be matter of the lively controversies to which it *seems* sometimes to give rise.

That all our *ideas* are (in the sense we are considering) only "relative," though false, is at least good English. "The relativity of *knowledge*" is an expression as absurd as "the contingency of the necessary." If we *believe* that *a* is *b*, then it appears that we are convinced without any remaining doubt that *a* is *b*. Still, *a* may not be *b*. If we *know* that *a* is *b*, then, irrespective of our conviction, *a* must be *b*. Belief and opinion are unlimited in their range, knowledge is limited to what *is*. *What is* cannot now not be. *What was cannot now* not have been. We can therefore only *know* that *a* is *b*, inasmuch as it is *now* impossible for *a* not to be *b*, and that we intellectually grasp this fact. Hence, it is clear that we cannot know naturally that the outer world is really what we take it for, nor, on the other hand, that it is in any way misrepresented to us, because it is altogether a matter of experiment outside the mind. But all moral, metaphysical, geometrical and mathematical propositions, all which stand originally on the base of consciousness, or are built on that base by reason alone, form a vast fabric of absolute certain knowledge, as objective *really* as Mont Blanc is *apparently* objective to a Swiss peasant. These can be called "subjective" or "relative" only in the harmless sense of belonging to us at a given moment.

With regard to the outer world, that the impressions that we receive from our senses are not exact accounts, *so far as they pretend* to be such, or are in any sense misrepresentations or illusions, is a proposition which no philosopher on earth can move one step towards *proving*; because the *first* step must be to compare the picture with the reality. For this purpose he must have a new set of faculties, which if he possessed to-morrow, he could proceed to doubt *them* also, and so on till he became the omniscient himself; and even then he could doubt his own omniscience till he had made an exact scrutiny of the whole contents of infinite space, and even this would have to be repeated *ad infinitum*.

MONT SAINT MICHEL—CHURCH, ABBEY AND FORTRESS.

THE old world built its beautiful cathedrals, churches, monasteries, centuries ago. How beautiful they were and are! No one will charge the new world with want of good will, if it has not, as yet, done as well as the old. Lack of means, peculiar circumstances, a mixed population, may be pleaded as fair excuses. But these cannot wholly explain our deficiencies, which are largely due to the loss of good traditions, to the influence of ideals less high than of old, and to neglect of the study of the best work of our forefathers. Our great Pope has turned the theologians and philosophers back to the master-mind of the 13th century—St. Thomas. The deepest, clearest thinker the world has had was, strangely enough, contemporary with the greatest architecture the Christian world has known.

Here, perhaps, we have been over-hasty to be apparently fine, showy; and this is not to be great. Simplicity, truth, power, the higher architectural virtues, have been too little valued. The misuse of materials, the repetition of details, more or less Gothic or Romanesque, the association of things unrelated, the stenciling and gilding of gingerbread, do not necessarily meet the requirements of Christian art any more than of science or worship.

When we come to things small in a sense, though not small in themselves, we see that our fathers of the good time were above the *carton-pierre* statue, the *papier-maché* stations, the ready-made altar, the fictitious metal candelabra, or the imitation Carrara marble kneeling angel. Noble material, original work of skilful hands, do not detract from God's honor, or from devotion. Moses is our witness—a worthy and ancient witness. Knowledge in all manner of work, the power to devise whatsoever may be artificially made of gold and silver and brass, of marble and precious stones and variety of wood, the spirit of God, with wisdom and understanding, all these had the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Juda, whom the Lord called to build aright, and ornament tabernacle, and ark, and vessels, and altars and vestments—small things and great.

To us Americans it may seem odd that the Lord did not seek skilful men in a strange land. Here and now, what should we do were it not for the charity of our French and German, and, sometimes, of our Italian and English brethren? How generously they supply us with "art-factory" work in gold, silver and electro-plate,

stones not too precious, glass that were better unstained, and the oleograph that shows neither the spirit of God, nor the power to devise, nor knowledge. Can it be that the Lord hath "put wisdom" only "in the heart of every skilful man" born beyond the sea? Perhaps we have too little confidence in Him, and too little consideration for the wisdom, and understanding, and power to devise that have been meted out to our American selves.

However, with all our failings in things great and small, we can boldly, if not proudly, claim, that our American churches are as good as many that have been built abroad within the last three centuries. When, in the near future, our art museums, emulating the example of Kensington, shall have set up true copies of the best work of the Middle Ages; when our seminaries shall make the serious study of church architecture a part of the regular course; when our colleges shall have awakened to the fact that the teaching of history, without an acquaintance with the work of men's hands, is not thorough teaching; then—and not till then—there will arise an intelligent, logical, artistic, characteristic American school of church architecture. Inasmuch as there is any church architecture here, worthy of the name, the country owes it to the Catholic Church. Inasmuch as our church architecture is no better than it is, Catholics must bear the blame. However, only they dare cast a stone, first or last, at themselves.

Through the photograph and the process-engraving, the "Magazine" and the "Art Journal," we find it easy, nowadays, to make ourselves acquainted with the general appearance of many of the cathedrals and churches that were designed out of the minds and made with the hands of our "ignorant, vicious, superstitious" forefathers of the 12th and 13th centuries. Pictures serve a purpose in education; but their value is limited where previous knowledge or the living, intelligent word, does not help the eye to see just what is visible, and to measure the real or comparative value of lines, of masses and of details. Still, the picture, by itself, is not to be despised. The interest which it excites often grows into desire for sober knowledge. And our "benighted" forefathers of the "Dark Ages" have left us more than enough of their conceptions and handiwork to whet desire during a lifetime.

Of late the etcher, having exhausted a wide range of subjects, has taken to architecture. We owe him a debt; for he has attempted only great things. Chartres, Rheims, Rouen, Amiens, Burgos, Seville, Batalha, Westminster—these you may see ranged on the walls of the printshop, challenging study of the etcher's methods, the science of the master-builder, and the skill of the mechanic and the sculptor. As it happens, the large etching is fashionable; and so the etcher has room to tell us of length and

breadth and height and power. As a copy, his work, if it be good, has no value. It is an interpretation, expressing feeling rather than facts. On this account, indeed, it appeals to a larger public; a public that is more open to picturesque effect than to the science of construction or the art of great design.

Among the many good things on the walls of the printshop, one more than another arrests our attention to-day. We forget the etcher; we see only the strong walls, burly towers, strange flying-buttresses, bits of delicate tracery, threatening bastions, rocks and sand, weeds and boats, and the solemn ocean. We are looking at Mont Saint Michel, church, abbey and fortress—"lazy" monks' work. This mighty mass, built upon the grim rock by the treacherous sea, witnesses to ten centuries of European history, to the rise and fall of peoples and dynasties, to civilizations old and new, to the fitful course of all our Christian arts. The student of history will find the Mont quite as worthy of study as will the student of architecture. The etcher's picture is striking, and yet it is a mere shred of the shadow of the real thing. Were it possible for the etcher to drill openings in those inky walls and sketch the lines they hide, we might, one by one, peer into the vast structures that underlie the apparent buildings, and thus gain some right notion of the whole. Our knowledge would still be far from complete. Only a pilgrimage to the Mont, or patient study of plan upon plan, and of elevation after elevation, will make us acquainted with the restless Norman's sacred fortress. Still, there is always something to be learned on a tour around the library. Let us try what we may there gather concerning Mont Saint Michel.

A few miles from the Mont, on a hill-top, stands the pretty little town of Avranches, which, were it famed for nothing else, will always be noted as the scene of the penance and pardon of passionate Henry II. of England. There he came, in 1174, to free himself from guilt for the foul murder of Thomas à Becket, and there, on the 22d of the month of May, he knelt on the stone steps of the cathedral to receive absolution from the Papal legate. As far back as 706 Avranches was a bishop's seat, and then it was that the sainted Aubert carried the pastoral staff. One night, while resting his wearied limbs, Aubert had a dream. The great Archangel Michael appeared to him, and in few words ordered him to build a church on Mount Tumba, as the bare rock in the sea was then called. Had Aubert's name been Thomas we might the more readily explain his way of dealing with the dream. He argued with himself, did the holy man; and in the end he decided that the dream was an illusion. Promptly he put it out of his mind. A few nights thereafter he had a like dream; but now the Archangel was more positive, ordering Aubert to begin the work forth-

with. The good bishop was not satisfied. He determined to "try the spirits." He prayed for light; he fasted; he watched; he gave alms to the poor, knowing that their heartfelt prayers would bring him heavenly grace. Once more in his sleep he saw Michael, who blamed him for his doubting, and who, as a sign of his displeasure, lifting a finger, tapped Aubert on the head. On the very next day the bishop called his clergy about him, told them his dream, and showed them the wound on his head. They saw and believed; and though Aubert lived fifteen years after that day, and though he suffered not in health, he bore the wound till his death. Doubt if you will; believe if you will. It was faith that made Mont Saint Michel.

Two years later, having overcome many difficulties, the bishop built a church on the rock; "not proudly," says the chronicler, "nor with much artifice, but simply, in the form of a grotto, capable of holding about one hundred persons." This chapel was consecrated on the 16th of October, 709. Then Saint Aubert founded an abbey, wherein he placed twelve clerics, or canons, whose duty it was daily to celebrate the divine office. Now, there was no water on the mountain, and the canons suffered much inconvenience. They had by this time learned to put trust in Saint Michael; so, with one accord, they joined in asking his aid. He gave ear to them, as it is written; and one fine day, appearing to the bishop, Michael led him down the mountain, and there, near the foot, in the rock, he showed him a bubbling, sparkling spring. And that same spring serves man and beast this very day; and you may see it with your own eyes, and drink of it as you will; and it is known, as it was known long before great Charles shook the world, by the name of "Saint Aubert's spring."

The story of the bishop's dream, and of the Archangel's apparition, quickly spread far and wide. There were pagans then, as now, as well as doubting Christians. But the believers were many, and soon a procession of pilgrims trudged penitently, hopefully, thankfully, to the simple chapel on bleak Mount Tumba. The Pope sent holy relics to Michael's shrine. Kings and dukes, bishops and abbots, knights and squires and villains climbed the steep, sharp granite rocks. To-day there are fewer kings and dukes, and—glory be to Saint Michael!—more plain people. Nor have all the plain people lost faith in Saint Michael. "From every schires ende" still "they wende" to the Mont, as they did eleven hundred years ago.

The first king that bent a knee in Aubert's chapel was Childbert II., a contemporary of the Saint. Would that no king had ever done worse! When the big, bold Rollo had fought himself into the duchy of Normandy, and won a crown and a wife, he

strove to become a real Christian. Still, old Thor was in the way; and, taking no chances, the new duke, before dying, offered up sacrifice to the great divinity of the North. But Rollo's successors were loyal sons of the Christ, and devout worshippers at the shrine of Saint Michael. Indeed, the warrior angel became the Normans' favorite patron. When they had made themselves masters of England, they covered the land with churches in his honor, and everywhere they chose the high places; witness Cornwall's rocky heights, which Edward the Confessor gave to the monks of the Mont, in 1048, and the twenty-eight sanctuaries that look down upon the plain of Lincolnshire. Michaelmas became the great church festival, whose importance the English customs of our 19th century still vouch for. Scale in hand, weighing souls, Michael surmounted chancel-arch in every shire, while, beneath, in silent chapel, from privileged altar, he gave willing aid to those who knelt under the lamp that never quenched, and implored his intercession.

When, seeking new worlds, the greedy Normans cast their eyes, longingly, on the vines and olives of Italy, their devotion was not satisfied with pilgrimages to their own holy mountain. High up on Monte Gargano, where the Apennines wall out the sea, the Archangel had appeared to Saint Laurentius, Bishop of Siponto, just two hundred and fifteen years before Aubert dreamed a dream, and felt the pressure of a warning finger. There in a cave in the rocks, where Michael's majestic self had stood, the not unselfish Normans crowded to beg the assistance of him who had thus far befriended them. To the stranger they left their famed sanctuary of Mont Saint Michel; proof of Norman faith and loyalty could best be given at Monte Sant' Angelo.

How long and devotedly the Archangel was honored on Norman ground will appear from a record of great names. Richard I., grandson of the giant Rollo, made more than one pious pilgrimage to Mont Saint Michel. Richard II. and Robert I. went there in turn, as did the three sons of William the Conqueror; Robert, duke of Normandy, he who pawned his dukedom that he might have money to carry himself and his men before the walls of Jerusalem; and William the Red, and Henry I., kings of England. The first of the Capets to honor Saint Michael was Louis VII., who, youth as he was, moved by the fiery Bernard's words, left his kingdom to fight for the Holy Land, during the second Crusade. On his way to the Mont, in 1158, he met Henry II. of England, and together they made the pilgrimage. When Saint Louis returned from the sixth Crusade, beaten, full of regrets, though not disheartened, he hastened to seek consolation in the sanctuary of the ever victorious leader of the heavenly hosts. Louis

was not to return. Far away from France, choked by the sand of the desert, plague-stricken, the good, brave king forever ceased battling. His loved and loving son, Philip III., did not forget Saint Michael. When he had tenderly borne on bent shoulders, from Marseilles to Saint Denis, his saintly father's bones and heart, and laid them down to rest awhile, he could think of no sweeter ending to his bitter journey than a pilgrimage to the Mont. The next Philip, *le bel*, who devised the shameful plot of Anagni, went the same road forty years later, in 1311. Charles VI., the mad king, with just mind enough to play cards and rule his fellow-debauchees, enjoyed a moment of reason at Michael's feet, in 1393. Mary of Anjou, to whom, after God and Jeanne d'Arc, Charles VII., "the king of Bourges," owed a real crown, journeyed to the Mont in 1447 to thank the Archangel for his aid at the battle of Nancy, where victory saved her son's throne. That unhappy son, Louis XI., paid no less than three visits to the Mont; the first in 1462; the second in 1470; the last in 1472. Charles VIII., who scourged Italy seven years later and met there the sudden death that Savonarola prophesied, left his favorite dogs and minstrels, in 1488, to visit the famous abbey, and, perhaps, to thank the Archangel for the victory of Saint Aubin. Gay Francis I. was truer to Michael than to many of his own royal and imperial brothers. He began his reign with a pilgrimage to the favored shrine; and, in 1532, seven years after he had lost all, *for l'honneur*, at Pavia, he bent a proud knee, for the second time, in the Church of the Archangel. Charles IX., son of the ambitious, luxurious, ill-fated Catherine de Medici, was sent to the Mont, in 1562, when a boy of twelve. He is the last king of France that publicly testified the faith of the nation in the power of him who is "like unto God."

Imagine Saint Aubert, in the flesh, walking by the side of Charles IX., as he entered the King's Gate and mounted the narrow street leading to the great abbey and church that had risen above the good bishop's grotto-chapel, built "not proudly, nor with much artifice." The Saint looks high up at the artful blocks of carved and moulded granite, piled one above the other; at the proud tower, and bridge, and barbican. He looks down upon the mighty ramparts, the circled turrets, crenellated parapets, closing out land and sea. Trembling, fearful, hopeful, he passes his jewelled hand across his dazed, doubting eyes. Is this, too, a dream? From out the brave retinue he slips unnoticed and descends the mountain. The spring, the Angel's spring, where is it? Why this tall, frowning tower? He presses the heavy gate; it yields; he enters. Still flow the sweet, clear, blessed waters. Saint Michael be thanked! As he speaks the words, and raises his eyes to Heaven, the good bishop utters a quick cry of joy. There, in the air, atop

the pointed spire, stands the figure of the great Michael, armored, sword aloft, wings full spread, awaiting the command of the Almighty; ready, anxious, to aid man in his strife with the Evil One. Your heart beats, burns, quivers with sainted Aubert's. The long-gone vision was no wicked illusion. Here, on bleak, lone, Mount Tumba, the Archangel is honored as nowhere else in this world. The Michaelion of great Constantine is nought to this. Where are now the fifteen shrines that once stood within Byzance's walls? Compare Rome's monument with Normandy's! Though Gregory's self saw Michael sheath his terrible sword above the Mole of Hadrian, and Boniface named the tomb anew—*Castel Sant' Angelo*; it is by this sounding title alone that Rome bears testimony to the glorious presence of the celestial Prince of the Church, and not by loving, zealous work of Christian hand and brain. And yet I doubted, I doubted, says Aubert, regretfully, reproachfully. Then bending his aureoled head, and penitently beating his breast with the one hand, and pressing the miraculous wound with the other, once more he climbs the rugged way, tearful and joyous.

The Mont Saint Michel, where Charles IX. lodged and prayed and shrived himself, was no creation of fanciful dreamland. It was a thing of human brawn and sweat, struggle and prayer, and travail of intellect. How it fared for two hundred and fifty years after Aubert's day we cannot tell. Whether the clerks' house and the chapel grew in size or in beauty, the chroniclers say not. The times favored neither building nor writing. What with the wars of Charlemagne, and the invasions of the savage Normans, Neustria, as the country was called before Rollo's peace at Saint Clair sur Epte, had no rest. When the invaders came, in the 9th century, the land around Avranches was laid bare. The people fled. As you look at the pictures of Mont Saint Michel, you see, down below abbey and church, a few random houses scattered over the hill-side. These make up the town of Mont Saint Michel. Fleeing before the harsh Normans some poverty-stricken, harmless souls sought a refuge on the barren rock by the treacherous sea. The monks welcomed them; and there, for nine centuries, amid all tribulations, the scions of the changing race of Neustria-Normandy have struggled into life and a grave. Of one at least of its townsmen and townswomen the Mont has reason to be proud—the famous Breton, Bertrand du Guesclin, and his wife, Tiphaine de Raguenel, *la Fée*. Bertrand, harsh of manner and ugly in person as he was strong of arm and of heart, gained the love of one of the most beautiful, the brightest, the most learned women of her day. The fairy, *la Fée*, so they called her; and the name, though the story says she earned it through her skill in

astrology, brings visibly before our charmed eyes the lithe, sprightly, artless, winning figure of her who slept on the bosom of the most valiant, the most loyal man of his day. In 1364, after his victory over the English at Cocherel, Du Guesclin was made Marshal of Normandy by King Charles V. Fortune failed him on the fatal field of Auray, where he fell into the hands of the enemy. Ransomed with a hundred thousand *livres*, he gathered a new army, and set out for Castile. Before leaving, he built a nest for fair Tiphaine under the eaves of St. Michael's abbey, where she could be safe from rude men and revengeful enemies, and where she might invoke the warrior angel's aid in behalf of her terrible warrior husband. Sixteen years later, distrusted by the prince for whom he had fought so long and so gallantly, a self-banished man, Bertrand died on the road to Spain, far away from St. Michael's. Neither *la Fée*, nor the Archangel, had cause to blush for him, as, with his last breath, he kissed his true sword, and said to the faithful friend by his side: I hand it to you, protesting that I have never done aught against the honor they put on me with this good weapon. His restless body found rest in St. Denis, among the kings of France. There, by the side of the friend to whom he gave his unspotted sword, Louis de Sancerre, you may see the tomb and the lifeless effigy of that "*Noble homme Messire Bertrand du Guesclin*," late of Mont Saint Michel. His heart rests in the Saviour's church at Dinan, not far from the Mont.

When pagan Rollo became the Christian Raoul, we know that he favored the canons who had been driven from the Angel's Mount. Few are the men who can bear prosperity. Wherefore, however perfectly we have borne ourselves in adversity, we may find excuse for the clerks of Saint Aubert, who later fell into evil ways. Less charitable, or more just, Richard the Fearless, grandson of Raoul, drove them out of the abbey in 966, and brought from famed Monte Cassino thirty Benedictines, with the grave and holy Abbot Mainard; and to these he intrusted the church and the abbey. And for 656 years the Benedictines ruled the Mont, honoring the Lord and singing praises to Michael, and filling the earth with his name. The Mont Saint Michel that compels our admiration is a monument not only to him who, according to Saint Jude, disputed with the devil about the body of Moses, but also to the skill, the intelligence and the faith of the spiritual sons of Saint Benedict.

About the year 1000, whatever buildings Mainard had erected were destroyed by fire. Richard II., duke of Normandy, son of Richard the Fearless, came to the aid of the monks, and after they had rebuilt the town and their own quarters, he determined to lay the foundations of a great church. He consulted with Hildebert,

the fourth Abbot, and placed in his hands the whole charge of the work. In the year 1020, Hildebert laid the first stone of our Mont Saint Michel. Of his plan, and design, we may judge from the existing transepts, and the four Roman bays of the nave. Hildebert planned a church with seven bays, three of which were destroyed at the end of the last century.

Abbot after abbot built and rebuilt for one hundred and fifteen years, when Bernard, the eighth since Hildebert, having finished the church, within and without, raised a "fine, high, strong tower, above the four great pillars of the choir," and beautified the noble edifice with windows of painted glass, a rare thing in those days. At long and at last the grand conception of Hildebert is a reality. Hildebert was no ordinary builder. Such a one would have cut down the crest of the rocky mount, and levelled it to a flat, uniform surface. Not so worked Hildebert. Leaving the Mont as nature had formed it, he planned a long and wide plateau on the level of the crest. Then, going down the mountain side, at the extremity of the line of the plateau that as yet had a reality only in his mind, he built, upward, a mass of mighty walls and arches, tied one to another, and again tied to the shelving rock. The mount itself was not more solid than this artificial foundation, which to-day astonishes architect and engineer. Had the monk done this massive work with our machinery and appliances, had his facilities for obtaining and handling the required materials been of the best, the result would have deserved highest praise. But where shall we stop in our commendation, when we mark the steep declivity of the rock, and the narrow, unsuitable space where Hildebert was forced to store and control the tools, the quarried stones, the scaffoldings, the centres, props, and all the masons' implements? Add to these difficulties the labor and the danger of transporting block upon block of granite from afar to Saint Michael's by the treacherous sea.

In periculo maris, so they called Mont Saint Michel before the Normans had set foot on French soil. What peril was there to fear from the sea? The tide, equalled only by that in Fundy's Bay. Sweeping onward, roaring, rushing, the maddened sea covers a length of six miles in a few short minutes. Twice each day the waves storm against rampart and bastion; twice they retire to gather new force in their battle with Michael. Woe to him who lingers on the sands to watch the tumbling, frothing waters, trusting to quick eyes and nimble feet to save him! When the waters have receded, only one who has learned the winding ways by heart dare trust himself, unguided, on the pathless shore, and among the treacherous quicksands. They named it well who called it Mont Saint Michel, *au péril de la mer*.

How justly proud, and how thankful, Abbot Bernard must have felt as he looked at the great church and thought of the labors and the disappointments of his brethren who had hoped to do what he did and failed! Between Hildebert's time and Bernard's, the seven abbots that mastered the work had busied themselves, now with the nave, now with the choir, now with the big pillars of the triumphal arch, or with the transept, the porch, the subterranean crypts. Here they took down work of their predecessors, to make it more substantial. There they carved and moulded anew, to add to its beauty. Roger, who ruled from 1084 to 1106, no doubt had great hopes that he might be the one to complete Michael's church. But, alas! on a sad morning, in the year 1103, as the monks were going out from matins, the greater part of the nave tumbled down, the granite blocks flying this way and that way, and doing serious damage to the neighboring buildings. It was the Saturday before Easter. Gloomily as the great feast must have been celebrated on the Mont, the monks found cause for rejoicing because not a soul had been injured; "a thing that every one held to be altogether miraculous." Roger II. was pressing the repairs with all speed, when, in 1112, a fire broke out in the abbey, and threatened general ruin. Again there was cause for rejoicing. The abbey buildings were consumed, but the church was safe and sound. Proud Bernard was yet to be humbled. In the third year after he had filled in the windows with the wonderful painted glass, wicked men from Avranches set fire to the town. The houses were burned down, the monastery disappeared; but Saint Michael guarded his church. Sixty-five years later the Archangel drew his sword from its sheath. There were terrible doings in Normandy at the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th centuries. Richard of the Lion-Heart, cruel John Lackland, and faithless Philip Augustus were fighting for the territory. Philip made himself master in 1199; but there was no peace in Normandy. Mont Saint Michel bore its share of the troubles. In 1203, Gui de Thouars tried to capture the *Mont*. He failed; and then, like a coward, set fire to the town. The science, and thought, and toil, and devotion of two centuries were turned to ashes in a day. The village homes, the abbey and its dependencies, the roof of the church, were all swept away. The strong walls stood up bravely, and the stone-vaulted aisles were proof against the flames; but nave and choir were bared to sun and storm. In time, the church roof was replaced, and the new abbey grew in size and beauty. And so, abbot and monk designed and ornamented, and fortified, year after year, until 1300. Then, on a stifling day in July, from out the angry clouds there shot a fearful bolt, whose glowing point struck full on Michael's bell-tower. Down fell the singing bells in

streams of molten melody. The massive new towers, at the sides, crumbled away; the church roof blazed up to heaven; and, last of all, the town houses sparkled and flared and smoked. Once more the sturdy Benedictines taxed mind and body to build a shrine to Saint Michael. Kings came to their aid; and after fifty years' thinking and toil, they had renewed church, abbey and town. Then, heaven tried their patience anew. In 1350, the destructive lightning again fired the roof of the nave and the abbey. Quite undismayed, under Nicolas le Vitrier and Geoffroy de Servon, the monks worked as freshly and vigorously as under the first Hildebert. Church, and hall, and dormitory put on a new dress; and pilgrim and monk watched, delightedly, the growing promise of things fairer than the old. By the year 1374 there was cause for much rejoicing. Hard work would soon be repaid, fond hopes be realized.

Was Michael displeased? Who can say? Suddenly, on the eighth day of July, another burning fire came down from heaven; nor did it cease its ravages until it had left the Mont just as sad a sight as it was in 1303. Pierre Leroy, the twenty-ninth abbot, and Robert Jolivet, his successor, restored, repaired, designed and built afresh. Church and abbey were more beautiful than ever, strong towers and walls had made the Mont secure against all attack. The abbot was now a military as well as a religious ruler—*Capitaine du Mont*. Before and after Agincourt, the English longed for the Archangel's fort; but it gallantly withstood arms and stratagems, and Abbot Jolivet's purchased treachery. And yet, strange to say, in 1421, on the eve of St. Martin's day, without sign or warning, the choir of the church, true and tried, with the apse, gave way; nothing being left of the wall above the choir stalls. During the next thirty years Mont Saint Michel suffered sore trials. The English besieged it, vainly, for eleven long years. The abbey lands were stolen; its costly vessels were sold to buy bread for soldiers and townspeople. Not until 1450, when the English had been driven out of Normandy, could the monks spare an hour to rebuild the ruined choir. Cardinal Guillaume d'Estouteville, statesman, churchman, soldier, held the abbacy; and he it was who began the elegant, dainty, Gothic choir that has come down to our day. Here, in Michael's church, the lover of architecture may readily study the style of the round arch at its best, and the style of the pointed arch on the eve of its decline; the solid, honest, solemn simplicity of the one, the delicate, refined, playful science of the other. Seventy years ran by before the choir was finished. Whoever is interested in Mont Saint Michel may well note the date—1521. No great work was done on the Angel's Mount from that time down to our day. The seventy years did not pass with-

out fears and risks. Somewhere about 1500 the lightning set fire once again to the tower, and melted the chiming bells. Then it was that Guillaume de Lamps, when he built a new tower, set up on its pointed roof a gilded statue of the Archangel, with wings outspread. Though 1521 marks the end of great undertakings, it does not close the story of misfortunes. A good part of the abbey was burned in 1524. Guillaume de Lamps' new tower stood the shock of a thunderbolt in 1594; but the roofs of tower and church were swallowed up in the flames. In 1776, the vindictive lightning dealt the noble old structure a blow more fatal than all the others combined. Twelve times had it unavailingly sought to shake the massive walls. At last the mighty structure quailed. Lest the whole church should be carried down, the west front, with its old Romanesque portal, and the three first bays of the nave were removed. Then the philosophers of the 18th century, who were glibly telling the world how dark the past had been, and how lightsome was the present, set up a brand new, bastard Roman-Greek façade, and a portal to match, in front of the four bays that had stood the wreck of time and heaven's artillery. Oh! for one hour of Richard the Fearless and his slashing followers! How quickly they would have done justice on their weak, blind offspring, that ignorantly, audaciously, disgraced the beautiful design of Abbot Hildebert!

The old Benedictines, in 1622, went the way of Saint Aubert's clerics. Long before that date, the French kings had managed to make their influence felt in the government of the abbey, through the appointment of abbots commendatory. At times these new abbots were non-residents. Many of them were interested in the Mont only inasmuch as their office put money in their purse. The Huguenot wars turned the abbey into a battle-ground. Religious discipline grew lax. Finally, the unworthy descendants of the men of Monte Cassino—of the earnest monks who had laid their hearts, shred by shred, between the granite blocks of the Church of Saint Michael—were removed; and in their place came the reformed Benedictines, the learned fraternity of Saint-Maur. With the French Revolution the vast structures that had been erected to glorify Saint Michael were turned into a prison. The monks had gone; and, by a strange fatality, their successors proved to be three hundred priests, all prisoners. And a prison Mont Saint Michel remained until 1863. Under Napoleon I., it was called a House of Correction; under Louis XVIII., a central prison. The church was turned into a workshop, a kitchen, an eating-room. When, in 1834, the Archangel's persistent enemy once more, in fiery shape, swooped down upon the Mont, the mutilated nave suffered seriously. The restorations that followed were contemptible. Over walls,

columns, arches and vault, plaster, colored to counterfeit granite, was freely laid. Saint Aubert was simple; the monks of the 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th centuries were proud and artful—the official architects of the early 19th century were barbarous.

We have closely followed the changing fortunes of the pilgrimage church from Aubert's day onward, because the church is the historical as well as the architectural centre of the Mont. It was the church that made Mont Saint Michel. With the centuries, however, the mean dwelling wherein Aubert's clerics gathered had developed into a splendid abbey. Building after building was grouped around the church. Abbot vied with abbot in planning and constructing. What they might have done, were human affairs not human affairs, none can tell. What they did ranks with the best—in part outranks the best—Gothic work of the best time.

The north side of the Mont was early chosen as the sight of the abbey; and there, by the end of the 11th century, the monks had built a chapter-house, dormitory, refectory, infirmary, kitchens and storehouses. As fire after fire destroyed a part, or the whole of these buildings, others more serviceable, more substantial, more, stately, rose out of the ruins. The *Galerie de l'Aquilon*, built by Roger II. between 1112 and 1122, remains to this day. Whoever would give his fancy play, may, from a study of this *Galerie*—a subterranean hall beneath the old *promenoir*, or cloister—reconstruct the new abbey that graced the Mont after the fire of 1112.

The toil of two centuries was undone by the bold, bad Breton, Gui de Thouars. King Philip hurried to make good the damage done to the home of the heavenly patron of newly acquired Normandy, and freely supplied the monks with funds. Within a year after the fire, Abbot Jourdain was busy laying the foundations of the grand buildings, rightly called in his day and ours—*la Merveille*, the "Wonder." Jourdain's learned and active predecessor, Robert de Torigni, who ruled the Mont from 1154 to 1186, had made it a centre of learning and of the arts. A lover of books, he had gathered and copied the choicest collection of manuscripts on the continent. *Cité des livres*, city of the books, so the bibliophiles of the 12th century called Mont Saint Michel. Robert was none the less a builder. Not satisfied with solidifying, enlarging and improving what had already been done, he chose fresh sites to the south and west of the church, and there erected a new pilgrimage-house and infirmary. Much of this work was standing when Jourdain took the reins in hand, and a part of it may still be seen. Jourdain did not disturb Torigni's buildings. *La Merveille* he placed on the north side of the Mont. Immediately adjoining the church, to the west, stood the old cloister, or *promenoir*, above the crypt or *Galerie de l'Aquilon*. East of the cloister, projecting

still more to the north, was the 11th century refectory. Back of this Jourdain laid the foundation of his fortress-abbey. He carried it outward on the north, looking full upon the sea. Hugging a part of the nave and the transepts of the church, it extends eastward far beyond the choir; presenting, on each of three faces, a noble front, full of vigorous life.

The name is one—*la Merveille*—but this “singular” name is applied to two buildings, which, though joined, and, on the main northern front, a unit—considered as a mass—were as emphatically distinguished one from another, exteriorly as interiorly. The purposes that either building served were determined not by Abbot Jourdain’s whims, but by the requirements of the daily life of the monks who followed St. Bennet’s rule. Abbot Jourdain had studied in a good school and was quite sure of himself when he designed the almonry, cloister, dormitory, chapter-hall and refectory. He arranged them after this fashion. In the eastern building he placed the almonry—a great room where alms were daily distributed to the poor; above this, the refectory first, and then the dormitory. On a level with the almonry, in the western building, there was to be a spacious cellar; next, a chapter-hall, adjoining the refectory; and, over these, beside the dormitory, a fine cloister. Jourdain did not live to see his beautiful scheme completed. He died in 1212. His immediate successors did not rest till they had given immortal life, in voiceful stone, to his ideas. Raoul des Isles, Thomas de Chambres, and Raoul de Villedieu, conscientiously, lovingly, finished the work. Just twenty-five years after Jourdain laid the first stone, *la Merveille* challenged time and the world. “*La Merveille*,” says Viollet-le-Duc, “is the finest example we have of the religious and military architecture of the Middle Ages.” Time, fortune, St. Michael, have been kind to the abbot-architect.

It was Thomas de Chambres who, about 1215, closed the vaulting and glazed the great windows and tiled the broad aisles of the refectory. Would you know the grandeur of simplicity? Then look at a photograph, or an etching, of this 13th century room. A flood of enlivening light pours through the spacious windows. Securely the central line of graceful columns bears the wide-spreading pointed arches, the unfaltering granite ribs and vault. As we look down the aisles, towards the generous fire-places, following with our eyes the varying, intersecting curves of ceiling and window arch, we feel the beauty of honest simplicity, and the vanity of plaster and ginger-bread. Except the carved capitals, and the rosettes of the vaults, there is no ornament. The mouldings are not devised to show the cunning invention of the designer, or the skill of the stonemason. Sincerity speaks out from every line. Jourdain would have dignity, comfort and simplicity daily guests

at the monk's table. Kings and merchant-princes have, indeed, sat in more luxurious dining halls, where glowing color, lascivious sculpture, wealth of ingenious ornament in gold, and marble, and precious woods, invited to enjoyment purely sensual ; but, certainly, no one has ever broke bread in a more becoming, inspiring, civilizing room than Jourdain's refectory on Mont Saint Michel. Not all the sons of progress have marched with even pace. Some few, indeed, are lame.

Our walk through the refectory has not lamed us, praised be Saint Michael! Here, then, by this vaulted passage, we shall make our way to the chapter-hall. As the name implies, Jourdain designed this room for the general meetings of the monks. And, though it probably served its original purpose as long as there were monks on the Mont, the chapter-hall has, for these four hundred years, been known as the *Salle des Chevaliers*. How did the change come about? In this way.

The walls of *la Merville* tell of the disturbed condition of affairs in Jourdain's time. With an eye to the future, the famous abbot sketched the plan of a fortified town. The work he began, his successors continued, the kings of France, now and then, aiding. About a hundred years after Jourdain's death, the Mont had become a fortress of such great importance that Philip, *le bel*, sent a garrison there. Then came military governors, and commendatory abbots. By the year 1389, less simple, more proud than in Aubert's day, the abbey and church sported *blasons*, with quaint heraldic devices—a star, and three roses, or three shells, beneath an abbot's crosier. To these, Louis XI. most graciously added three royal *fleurs-de-lys*.

Louis counted himself a debtor to Saint Michael. It was the Archangel who gave a sacred mission to the Maid of Orleans, in the vision under the storied beach that crowned the hill of *Notre Dame de Vermont*, close by Domremy. To him Jeanne appealed, when, in full armor, she defiantly rode her black charger to battle; to him she offered her last prayer on the scaffold. To Michael, through Jeanne, Louis' father, Charles VII., owed the sceptre of a united France. The wily Louis was at least not ungrateful. He felt the weight of a double obligation. For when he took up arms against his father, and was driven into Dauphiné, a banished man, he gained comfort and favors through the Archangel's intercession. Charles thought of showing his gratitude to Michael by establishing a military order on the Mont. Eight years after Charles's death, in 1469, Louis, remembering his father's wishes, and desirous of showing his own reverence for "*Monseigneur Saint Michel*, the first Knight," instituted the Order of Saint Michael. The membership of this order was limited to thirty-six, all gentlemen without

reproach. They were sworn to sustain and defend the rights of the crown, and encouraged to give an example that would excite high, noble, and virtuous actions. What a brave sight they were as they sat in the choir of the church, on St. Michael's feast, clad in long mantles of cloth of silver, or white damask, ornamented with strings of brodered shells and edged with ermine! How light chased light over the folds of the cramoisy hood; and the ribs of the golden shells that formed the knightly collar, and the jewels set in the golden image of Michael that hung down upon each breast!

The statutes of the new order provided for general meetings or chapters, and the monks placed their chapter-hall at the disposition of the knights. There they met for the first time—and, as far as we know, for the last time—in 1470. Once was enough. From that day the chapter-house has been known as the *Salle des Chevaliers*.

The effect of this great hall, the largest, if not the grandest, Gothic room in the world, is only second to that of the beautiful refectory. If some critics would award the palm to the *Salle des Chevaliers*, it were hardly worth the while falling out with them on that score. First, or second, the hall of the knights was splendidly conceived and admirably executed. More vigorous in design, less severe, more picturesque, it is hardly less simple than the refectory. There is no ornament beyond the free, bold carving of the capitals, and of the keys at the intersection of the vaulting ribs. Seen in perspective—the four broad aisles lighted from the windows of various shapes in the north wall and from the large west bay—the *Salle des Chevaliers* will impress the dullest mind with a sense of the beauty and spiritual power of great architecture; and will warm the coldest, pettiest soul with enthusiasm, however momentary, for things higher and nobler than *bric-a-brac*. As with delight we look across the spacious aisles, or up at the groined vaulting, let us not forget to speak a word of thanks to the shade of Abbot Raoul des Isles, who commenced the *Salle des Chevaliers* in 1215, and of Abbot Thomas de Chambres, who completed the noble hall in 1220.

We mount the stairway in the northwestern angle, and here we are in the cloister—Jourdain's cloister let us call it, though Thomas de Chambres began and Raoul de Villedieu finished the delicate work. Remembering the height at which we stand, and the two vaulted halls below, we promptly appreciate the problem that presented itself to the original designer, and the skilful way in which he solved it. In the third volume of the *Dictionnaire Raisonée* Viollet-le-Duc calls attention to the science displayed in the arrangement of the shafts and the construction of the arcade; and

the cloister he describes as "one of the most curious and most complete in France." Those who would study the plan at leisure, and discuss questions of construction, will find serviceable material not only in the *Dictionnaire*, but also in M. Edouard Corroyer's *Description de l'Abbaye du Mont Saint Michel*,* a work on which the writer has freely drawn.

The ornamentation of the cloister is more elaborate than that of the *Salle des Chevaliers*. Abbot de Villedieu had about him a number of clever stonecutters, and at least three good carvers. Over the south door leading to the church they left their portraits, perchance, and their names. Time has mutilated the features beyond recognition, but the names remain: Magister Roger, Dominus Garin, Magister Jehan—a monk and two laymen. They gave full play to their fancy in the tasteful frieze under the cornice; and in the one hundred and forty rosettes, all differing; and the quaint figures that enriched the spandrils of the interior arcades.

The 13th century was flooded with a holy light: Dominic, Francis, Aquin. Thomas was born, some men say, on the very day that Francis of Assisi died. In the history of art, as of morals, the seraph holds a large place; and his influence is felt more than we measure in the present. Had we no other record of his power over his contemporaries, this beautiful Norman cloister would suffice to prove the fact. Francis breathed out his sweet breath on the 27th of September, 1226, in the mother-house of Saint Mary of the Angels, at Assisi, where the Benedictines had generously housed himself and his twelve dear brothers. On the 16th of July, 1228, Gregory IX. went to the city of St. Francis, opened the tomb of him who was proud of being accounted a fool for Christ's sake, and solemnly declared him a canonized saint. No sooner had the news reached the Mont than Villedieu set a *magister* or *dominus* to reproduce, on the western side of the cloister, a counterfeit of Francis, "according to the form and figure that Abbot Joachim had caused to be painted in St. Mark's, at Venice, just before Francis founded his order" of Friars Minor. And, beside the likeness, Raoul carved an inscription, wherein it was set down that the cloister was "perfected" and good Francis canonized in one and the same year, to wit, 1228.

A photograph, or etching, or engraving, may convey something of the delicacy, the lightness, but not the glowing beauty, of the cloister in Raoul's day. We lose the effect of the many colored granites, of the enameled floor, and, more than all, of the bright

* *Description de l'Abbaye du Mont Saint Michel, et de ses abords, par M. Edouard Corroyer, Architecte du Gouvernement. Paris, Dumoulin, MDCCCLXXVII.* Since the publication of this work, quite a literature has grown up around the *Mont*, but M. Corroyer's book is still the most useful, the most learned, and the most artistic.

tints that enlivened arch, and vault, and cornice. Mentally, we may crowd the galleries with black-garbed monks, or armored knights; or, better still, we may, in quiet hours, imaginatively stroll around the cloister, admiring designer's, and carver's, and cutter's art, and longing, if not for the days that are gone, at least for the spirit that informed them. By no trick of imagination, though, can we lift ourselves up to the little windows between the buttresses in the north front, and look thence out on the wide expanse of treacherous sand and passionate sea that day after day warned the monks against the world they had not unwisely fled.

La Merveille was not the only wonder on the Mont. There were, and are, the *Crypte des Gros Piliers*, the great cellar called *Montgommerie*, *Belle Chaise*, the *Chatelet*, the *Tour Perrine*, the giant stairway—all wonders in their way, and all showing science, a contempt for difficulties, and a thorough sense of great design. What an interesting tale of wars, sieges, attempted surprises, valiant, cowardly, bloody deeds, new weapons and new methods of warfare, is connected with the ramparts of Mont Saint Michel! Like the abbey and church, they were neglected for almost two centuries. Viollet-le-Duc's tribute to the Mont would have served as an appeal to a nation loving its best art and proud of its history. The men of the second empire were busy undoing France. They read and passed on. It was left for the republic, under Marshal MacMahon, to make away with the barbarous work of the 18th century, and to take steps to preserve the glorious monument in its integrity.

The monks no longer debate things temporal or spiritual beneath the vault of the chapter-hall; no longer sit at table in the noble refectory; no longer pace the way of the beautiful cloister. And yet the churchmen are not unmindful of Saint Michael. Robert holds the place of Aubert, not as bishop, or abbot, but as plain priest, guardian of the Order of Saint Edmé of Pontigny, caretakers of the abbey.

There are, at this very day, Philistines in the pulpit, the chair, the editor's sanctum, the studio, as well as at the literary man's desk, who are proud of exposing their simple ignorance by a senseless abuse of monks, "monkery" and "monkishness." And yet had there been no Monte Casino, no Citeaux, no Clairvaux, no Cluny, no Westminster, or Dunfermline, and no memory of Saint Gallen, the noble abbey, church and fortress of Mont Saint Michel would have made all intelligent men feel that the monk was a man to be respected, and a teacher to be revered. William the Conqueror, whose intellect was not inferior to that of some modern preachers and writers, and who might fairly pit himself against the variety of German "artist" who still makes a living by painting

beer-bellied Lutheran monks in a wine-cellar, hastened to plant monasteries in England as well as in Normandy. In France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, England, the monuments of great Gothic architecture are monuments to "monkery"—to "monkish" power of intellect, sense of beauty, of grandeur, of fitness. Taking the Mont as a centre, we may readily acquaint ourselves with the right measure of ecclesiastical art that was abroad in the 11th century—at Falaise, where William was born, so it is said; at Bocheville, or at Caen, in the simple parish church of Saint Nicholas, or the splendid *Abbaye aux Hommes*, which holds the Conqueror's sturdy bones, and which he built in memory of Hastings; or in the more elegant *Abbaye aux Dames*, where his wife, Matilda, lies buried. A glance at these buildings will tell us that the æsthetic hunger of the inchoate Frenchmen of those days was not to be filled with gingerbread, and that the "monkish" designer was less taken up with detail and ornament than with a great ideal and its just expression.

Inasmuch as the monks did the brave things that thrill us to-day, they did what was in them. Their traditions cannot be wholly lost. If the American monk would revive these traditions among us, we might count on an art rivaling the best of the best time—the 13th century. A good copy is better than a poor original. Here, we are young enough, fresh enough, to be original. What we want is a start in the right way. Can we doubt that *Monseigneur Saint Michel* served the Benedictines, on the Mont, in mind as well as body? Certainly, he has pressed a terrible finger into many a cowed head, year by year through the ages—as a corrective; but, he is ever ready to help in gentleness as in sternness. Perhaps an American saint is soon to dream a dream! Or, perhaps again, the etcher has been "called" to breathe new life into great architecture. With great architecture will come great art, and "knowledge in all manner of work." Wisdom and understanding and the spirit of God, how shall we assure these? For, according to Moses, the Lord deemed them needful for art applied to His worship. To Michael's power, one who knew men's weakness, that "wicked man and great king," Louis XI., paid a tribute worth remembering: *Qui nous peut plus ayder que cet Archange au monde?*

WILL THE POPE LEAVE ROME?

“IT is rumored that the Pope will leave Rome.” Such has been the text of a good many leading articles in the anti-Catholic journals of our time. The explanation of the rumor is its improbability. Because it is unlikely that the Pope will leave Rome, his enemies try to console themselves with false reports. The Italian revolutionists, like most of the free-thinkers all over the world, have an instinct that the Pope ought to remain in Rome, and have therefore a passionate desire that he should quit it. We do them no injustice in attributing to them this dual attitude, since they admit it in all their writings and speeches. They tell us that the harmonies of the Catholic religion require the Pope's presence in his own city; but since it is desirable to get rid of the Catholic religion, it is desirable to get rid of the Pope's presence. Sometimes the journalists will cloak their adherence to this opinion by professions which are meant to seem as if they were friendly. We had an instance of this kind of writing in the London *Pall Mall Gazette*, at the beginning of the month of August of this year. The writer said: “If the Papacy is still to be a world-power, the Pope ought to leave Rome, or rather to be driven out of it. The one thing which would shake our skepticism in the providential mission of the Holy See would be the establishment of the Papal throne in the English-speaking world. It is about time that the Catholic Church was occidentalized. It has been Romanized too long for the adequate realization of its cosmopolitan pretensions.” Now here we have a complete misapprehension—we do not like to say a wilful misstatement—of the theory and the fact of Catholicity, which should seem to be absolutely impossible in this nineteenth century. “It is about time that the Catholic Church was occidentalized!” So that the writers and the readers of the *Pall Mall Gazette* must be presumed to be of opinion that the western Church—which most sane people are accustomed to regard as an established fact—is purely mythical, or at the most but a shadowy branch of a small sect which is declared to be “Romanized.” It would not be worth while to notice such writing, were it not that a misconception of the whole structure of the Catholic Church underlies the geographical inaccuracy. We may be pardoned if we dwell for a moment on that misconception before speaking of our duties to the present Pope. The *Pall Mall Gazette* writer thinks that Rome is much too “local.” He considers that the Roman Pontiff ought to travel. Very briefly let us consider what was the idea of the Papal

throne, in its bearings on the pagan capital of the Roman world ; or, to put it differently, what was the apparent design of divine providence in supplanting the imperial Rome by the Pontifical ?

The idea of the Christian empire was to "carry out" the Roman *civitas* ; to create the right of Catholic citizenship in the Catholic Church—a right from which no human being would be excluded. St. Augustine, in his *De Civitate Dei*, exquisitely worked out this idea ; and, having before him the experience, the observation, of the Church's infancy, he was able to do this experimentally. The question for the whole world was : which should succeed, the pagan or the Christian dominion ? The answer was : the new Christian *civitas* took the place of the old Roman *imperium*. But the point of points, in the realization of the idea, was that the "City of God" should be wholly independent of the dominion of the city of the world. Whereas, in the pagan city,—as Bossuet expressed it, "*tout était Dieu excepté Dieu lui-même*," in the Catholic city nothing that was not divine could have any place in the building up of the dominion. The pagan Romans knew this. *Deletum nomen Christianum* meant that two names, two dominions, could not possibly co-exist in the same idea. The idea of Catholicity was God's city. The idea of paganism was the city of the world. The two ideas were to be henceforth at deadly feud. So far as the principles of truth and justice were concerned, the world must never again dictate to the Church ; it must, on the contrary, obey it. "We have no king but Cæsar" must now be changed into the formula, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." "We will not do it," said the unconverted Roman world. And ten bloody persecutions showed they meant it. For nearly three centuries the city of God and the city of the world were in a conflict which meant death to one of the two. The Church conquered. And it conquered *because* it would not permit any compromise between two standards which had nothing in common ; between the city of the moral power of truth and the city of the material power of the world.

But let us speak more particularly of the city of Rome, as being the capital of the new "City of God." Rome was ; Rome is ; but the idea of the "City of God" was that it should supplant, should occupy the place of, the empire which had been the great power of polytheism. We all know that the *Civitas Dei*, in the beautiful sense of St. Augustine, was comprehensive of all the members of the Christian Church ; yet just as Rome had been the centre of a false religion, so Rome must be the centre of the true. The "city set on a hill"—to keep to the sense of St. Augustine—must be a city which every human intelligence could contemplate as the most obvious, the most conspicuous, of facts. And so, too, the

Christian capital of the new world, the new centre of what was henceforth to be Christendom, must be conspicuous as was the old pagan Rome, though in senses which should be as spiritual as appreciable. And a man must be blind not to see that Almighty God chose Rome for the new centre of the new struggle. As a matter of fact, it was the centre—it is the centre; yet in point of analogy, and of the clearest divine intimation; as a beautiful and luminous teaching of divine providence, which even the pagans understood in a negative sense; the placing of the centre of unity on the ruins of the world's city; the making that centre to be the very identical centre of which it was said "all roads lead to Rome," was a teaching so striking that all mankind must acknowledge it as being impossible to mere accident or chance.

"Will the Pope leave Rome?" is, therefore, a question which must be answered by appeal to eighteen centuries of Catholic belief. He may leave the city of Rome, as the Popes have often left it,—at one period for a long absence of seventy-three years,—but if he leaves it, he will return to it; or, being absent, he will still rule it, as the Supreme Pontiff who must be always subject to persecution. But it is strange that, in this 19th century, even Protestants cannot understand that the centre of unity is liable *only* to be persecuted. It is not liable to be obliterated; it is not liable to be conquered; no weapon that is formed against it can prosper; yet it can be harassed and gravely afflicted by a thousand mortal weapons, whose ugly sharpness is sure to be turned against their framers. And here let a distinction be drawn between Rome and what is called United Italy. Italy is not Rome, nor Rome Italy. True, as Leo the Thirteenth has expressed it: "In Italy God has placed the home of His vicar, the chair of truth, and the centre of Catholic unity,"—a fact which the immense majority of living Italians recognize as their most glorious national privilege,—but the home, the chair, the centre, are in the once pagan capital of the pagan world, and in the now Christian capital of the *Civitas Dei*. They are placed there because Rome was the centre of that world which the *Civitas Dei* was meant to conquer. Surrounded by a thousand pagan monuments, the Christian churches in Christian Rome stand in triumph. And even in the ancient catacombs it is now nearly two thousand years since the first Christian emblems effaced pagan emblems; since the first Christian inscription in honor of a martyred Pope was written on the back of a pagan marble, which had been set up in honor of a "divine emperor."

To force the Pope, therefore, to quit Rome is one thing; that the Pope should voluntarily quit Rome is another. To force the Pope to quit Rome is only the continuance of the same hostilities which imprisoned the first Pope, St. Peter; and it must issue in the same

greater freedom. Persecution is not conquest, but probation. If the ten persecutions, backed by imperial hosts, could not obliterate the *nomen Christianum* in the days when the Church was in its infancy, we may fairly argue that Masonic sects, backed only by heresy and schism, cannot in these days do more than court defeat. But the point we have to consider is the fact of the *Civitas Dei* being centred, in point of authority, in the Roman Pontiff. It is a fact which is always admitted by adversaries; it is only attenuated or travestied. Authority is Pontifical. Nor is it an accident that the chair of Peter is in Rome; it has been so from the beginning, and must be so. In the older dispensation Jerusalem and its Temple were the centre of the idea of the Jewish faith; and not until the veil of the Temple was rent could the idea be made to yield to a higher idea. What may be called the historic aspects of Judaism, as well as the historic aspects of Christianity, are inseparably associated with place. We live in a material world, though our faith in spiritual truths must be spiritual; the body of the Church, like the body of the soul, requiring the fitness of symmetry or presentation. The city set on a hill must be symmetrical; nor would it be conceivable that the *Civitas Dei*, which supplanted the city of the world, should not present easily appreciable characteristics. Divine authority is a fact, not a dream; it claims obedience, not mere sentiment or opinion; and to be obeyed it must be known, must be seen, must be realized, even more than are ordinary judicial tribunals. When our Divine Lord "went up to Jerusalem" to be crucified, the Jews *knew* that He went up to their holy city. Was it an accident that our Divine Lord went up to Jerusalem? And if it was not an accident, but, on the contrary, a grave lesson, of which the fitness of place was a chief feature, then, as Jerusalem was destroyed because it tried to destroy its Lord, so must Rome deserve to be punished when it outrages God's vicar, whose See has been divinely placed there, and kept there. Divine authority is not local,—no such idea could be sustained,—but it is central, so that the obedient can gather round it as one family, and so that all men may recognize what Leo the Thirteenth calls its "home," its "chair," the "centre of Catholic unity." And Catholics have always recognized this centre. Authority and the Holy See are one idea. The source of authority and the streams which flow from it are not different ideas, but are one idea. "Rome" has always meant this idea. In the early and middle ages a Papal Rescript was spoken of by the very simple title, *auctoritas*. "Rome has spoken," or "authority has spoken," were, and still are, the same thing. We read how Pope St. Zoizimus sent "an authority" to the bishops of France; how Pope St. Leo sent "an authority" to the bishops of Spain; how the Em-

peror Marcian asked for "an authority" from Rome; and how St. Isidore expressed his belief that a Pontifical "authority" was equal to a definition by an ecumenical council. Now the "idea" of all such belief is that of the central authority; and it would be difficult for the human reason to conceive of a central authority which should have no fixedness of see or of throne, but which, like the opinionativeness of the sectaries, should look up to the clouds for its inspirations, and look down upon itself for their interpretation.

History has furnished us with such abundant repetition of wicked conflicts with Pontifical Rome that we are crowded with illustrations of the world-admitted fact that "Rome" means the centre of the *Civitas Dei*. We may glance at a very few illustrations. What is called the "Reformation" was a recognition throughout Europe that the Roman Pontiff and Authority were identical; Protestants, so-called, making their admission of the authority to be the reason of the obligation of resisting it. It was against authority itself, as "cramping the human mind,"—not against this or that teaching of it,—that the Protestant "philosophy" was most hostile. The word Rome to the Protestant mind, as indeed to the Catholic mind, meant the centre of the institution, the Teaching Church; the immovable, unchanging rock of power, round which the *Civitas Dei* dwelt in peace. It was *because* Rome was the citadel of doctrinal peace that the insurgent mind rebelled frantically against its doctrines; the citadel being impossible to be destroyed, but the doctrines being possible to be repudiated. Now this idea of unity—the true Christian idea—was and must be inseparable from the Holy See; just as the idea of the old Roman empire was inseparable from the idea of pagan Rome. We all know that Almighty God *could* have placed the centre of unity in any country or in any village of the world; but He placed it where the greatest of all worldly powers had centred its worldliness and its paganism. It is the fact which gives the force to the idea. And against that fact, that idea, all anti-Christian rebellion has been levelled for nearly two thousand years.

The "Reformation was really decentralization," and was therefore the principle of disunion. The lesser conflicts between the world and the Popes have been conducted on precisely the same principle. And here we may allude to what must be called an historic fallacy, though it is highly popular with most of the enemies of the Papacy. No one would wish to affirm that all the Popes have acted wisely under every circumstance of trial or irritation. "I have not understood the world, and the world has not understood me," were the last words of Pope Gregory, who died in 1417, after a turbulence which seemed to shake even the *Civitas Dei*. In an age when both

the Pope and the anti-Popes were asked to submit their claims to a general council, there was enough of havoc to shake the serenity of the wisest men, in both the political and religious spheres of thought. When kings and emperors wanted, practically, to be Popes themselves, and therefore tried to set up their vassal anti-Popes; when Pope after Pope was threatened and insulted by tyrants, by robber soldiers, by depraved mobs, it would have been strange if the voice of Peter could have been always clearly heard in Christendom, above a tumult which was confounding to the best Christians. During the seventy-three years when the Popes ruled from Avignon,—seven French Popes, and all men of fair ability,—was there not enough in the very fact of their being at Avignon to disturb the ideal harmonies of the Papacy? There is no need to be apologetic for feeble Popes—assuming that any of the Popes could be called feeble—any more than to be apologetic for our Lord's Apostles, because perfection was not the stamp of the whole number; the Church has not ruled that every Pope must be impeccable; there is no rule even of personal celebrity or of rare saintliness; all objections which are personal are but the cavillings of wilful enemies, who will not distinguish between the office and the man. Yet we may go so far as to say that in the whole history of the world, for ability, for discretion, and for personal virtue, the line of Popes can stand comparison with the greatest ones of the earth, to their own now happily recognized advantage. But such reflections are only congruous in this way, that they serve to show that the centre of divine authority, the Holy See, placed by God in the city of Rome, is in harmony with even such natural requirements as men of the world would desire to insist upon. More than this cannot be looked for in a sinful world. There was no promise of personal perfection to the Popes. The promise was that, as teachers, they should be preserved from teaching errors in whatsoever appertained to the Catholic faith.

The person and the office of the Pope have been ever divinely associated with the Holy See; and the Holy See has been divinely placed in Rome; so that "Rome" stands for person, office, see. Now, in all the great contests of the world with the Holy See, the world has fully recognized this idea of the centre of unity, this fact of the Roman Pontiff being God's vicar. The Church itself has not recognized it more fully, though of course in a totally different spirit, than have the enemies of religion and of unity. Gallicanism recognized it and disliked it. Protestant England has recently recognized it in the Irish controversy, and has even sent its own emissary to Rome.

A century ago, when Pius VI. was Pope, Mr. Pitt, who was Prime Minister, boldly recognized it, and the British nation even approved

the recognition. Mr. Pitt wrote to Pius VI. to say that if His Holiness would consent to publish a bull of coalition, so as to oppose the anarchical dangers of the period, England would send a fleet to protect the Roman states, and an ambassador to honor the rule of the Supreme Pontiff. What was this but the recognition of the central power? And so again, to speak of Prussia, which within the last quarter of a century has made "Rome" the supreme object of its antagonism. The Prussian Kulturkampf was at once a sort of savage recognition and a sort of savage repudiation of the centre of unity. Prince Bismarck sought to make the Catholic Church the slave of (his own) Protestant state, and received this answer from the Prussian bishops: "The Church cannot recognize or allow the pagan principle, that the state is the source of all power, and that the Church has a claim to those rights only which are conceded to her by the state." Prince Bismarck's idea was to make the Catholic clergy his nominees, and so to separate them from the centre of unity, which was Rome. Brutal and uncivilized were his methods for transferring the Papal authority to himself. Berlin was to become the seat of the new antagonism, and Prince Bismarck the new pontiff of German Protestantism; the laws which were to accomplish this end would have disgraced even the worst Roman emperors; the clergy who obeyed "Rome" rather than Prince Bismarck were to be "subject to restrictions as to their place of abode, such as had hitherto been binding upon persons who had been imprisoned, and who had to be subject to the surveillance of the police." No insult was too deep or too spiteful to accomplish the one end in view: the breaking up of the centre of unity, which centre all the world knew to be Rome. And what has been the issue of the contest? Leo the Thirteenth became master of the situation. And whereas Prince Bismarck is now regarded by the whole world as having failed, with all his hosts and his "iron heel," to make Berlin the new centre of disunion, the vicar of God is *more* recognized in the present day than he has been at any time since the "Reformation," as the guardian of the centre of unity of the Christian Church. "Rome" was the fortress to be attacked, because Rome was the acknowledged centre of unity; but the *Civitas Dei*, which knows that Rome is its own, had no fear for the ultimate issue of the conflict. The Supreme Pontiff may have lost the Papal states, but it is impossible that he should ever lose the Holy See. And to refer now for one moment to other countries. Catholic Belgium, which is ruled by a Masonic conspiracy, has been forced to accept a "neutral" system of education; the object being to prevent "Rome" from exercising that authority which, because it was central, must preserve unity. In France, also, the suppression of the congregations with other

iniquitous warfares against "Rome," have been intended to work the destruction of the central power, and to transfer the supreme rule to the state. In Italy, at the present day, the efforts of the civil government are being directed to legalize what is anti-Catholic; marriage without religious rites, education without Christianity, and the state suppression of Catholic properties or institutions, being the weapons which are fondly used by the revolutionists.

In all such cases we have the spirit of decentralization, which is another word for rebellion against "Rome." Let us speak, however, of what are called "historic" incidents. Perhaps the most remarkable of the modern instances of "decentralization" was the first Napoleon's personal warfare against Pius VII. The whole story was a wondrous homily on its own folly. An humble and retiring Benedictine monk had been raised to the supreme office of God's vicar; and against him were arrayed the forces of the greatest conqueror of modern times, who naturally "compelled the Pope to leave Rome." The motive for the hostility was simply this, that Napoleon had ordered that all the sea-ports in Europe should be closed against his then enemy, the English; and the Pope had answered him that the Roman states were his own, and that he did not allow even the mighty Napoleon to dictate to him. Napoleon, losing his temper, had the Pope dragged from his capital, and then proceeded to annex the Roman states. The Pope was Pope still at Savona; but Napoleon called Rome the second city of the French empire, and his son he afterwards called King of Rome. And how ended this conflict of the unequals? Did the weak Pope yield to the strong emperor, or the strong emperor to the weak Pope? The Pope returned in triumph to the Eternal City, and his captor died a prisoner at St. Helena. Volumes have been written on this episode in ecclesiastical history, but the "moral" is sufficiently voluminous in itself. It is perfectly true that Napoleon, so soon as he was made first consul, had "restored" the Catholic religion to Catholic France; just as it is perfectly true that he wished the Pope—Pius the Seventh, whom he had de-throned,—to come to Paris and reign with him in Papal glory; Napoleon's idea being that, if the Pope would rule from Paris, his Holiness would be simply the emperor's superb chaplain. How feeble, if how cunning, a presumption! Napoleon knew that Rome was the Pope's city; he knew that where the Pope was there was the centre; and he imagined that by simply changing the centre of unity, he could make himself its master, almost its Pontiff. Pius the Seventh only answered: "*Non possumus.*" And it would have been well for Napoleon if he had thought the same. In a few years the Vicar of God was back in Rome. Poor Napoleon wished he had never made him quit it. Yet the answer to the question,

"Will the Pope leave Rome," was in Napoleon's day precisely what it is now, and what it was when Garibaldi besieged Rome: "The Pope will not leave Rome; he may be driven from it; but if he should be, he will return; for it is his See."

II.

But the idea of the centre of unity is not solely ecclesiastical, though "the ecclesiastical" gives the tone to the whole idea. It would be impossible in such a city as Rome, where the old world has still its grandest monuments, to dissociate the ideas of every branch of education from the primary idea, which is unity. A scattered Rome, a removed Rome, is an impossibility. A usurped Rome jars enough on the sense of fitness. A merely royal Rome, or a republican Rome, is also incongruous. The idea of Rome is the central combination of everything which the Christian world accounts civilized. Education, and therefore the arts and sciences, must necessarily gather round the Supreme Pontiff. They must do so, because religion must tone and purify all that is true, as well as direct all studies in a Christian groove. For such reasons Christian Rome has been for centuries the natural home of what may be called the Christian intellect of the world. The temporal power is thus proved to be a necessity, if in the sense only of the peaceful pursuits of the intellectual. Every one who lived in Rome when Pius the Ninth was Pope-King will remember with what serenity all Christian studies could be pursued, and this, too, equally by non-Catholics and Catholics. Not in the whole world was there any place where intellectual cultivation could be conducted under such favorable circumstances. The place itself was an education; while the institutions, almost countless, and perfectly organized, all ministered to the educational idea. The fine arts were simply homed in the Eternal City. And this of itself is a most important consideration. The temporal power guaranteed peaceful study. The Popes have for centuries affirmed this. It has been said—and there is some truth in the assertion—that "Pope Nicholas the Fifth was the first Pope to make Rome the centre of Christendom, in the sense both of the fine arts and religion." His idea was that Rome had been too dependent on worldly sovereigns, who had "used" Rome as they used their armies or navies. In the earlier and fighting ages, when even ecclesiastics were sometimes martial, there was a rudeness which has now passed out of civilization. Rome could not be the home of all that was honored by the human intellect, unless it could be the home-city of the Popes, independent of external influences or ambitions. It became so. For centuries, art, science and literature have been as much at home in Rome as have the schools of

theologians or the religious orders. To this day the same spirit breathes in Rome. Not even revolutionary municipalities can quench it with their painfully modern ideas. And this is a point which should enter largely into the calculations of "men of the world," who sit in judgment on the Papacy. Is it nothing to have a centre of civilization, where religion and the fine arts can flourish in perfect harmony? where the students in every branch of education can combine their natural and supernatural aspirations? Catholics, of course, admit this; but would not all Protestants admit it also, if they would allow reason, not prejudice, to be their guide. Not only is it obvious that, for the unity of education, in every branch which can even remotely touch religion, the Supreme Pontiff should gather round him "schools of thought"; it is also obvious that in the most artistic city in the world—indeed the one city which is past and present at the same time—there should be that intellectual freedom which is impossible to revolution—which is possible only under the rule of the Pontiff-King.

And to take yet one more instance of the same fitness. The "Christian world" now wholly recognizes that it is time that *arbitration*,—of some sort,—which has not been fully determined, should take the place of hasty rushing into wars. In the words of Count Kamarowski: "If there existed in the midst of Europe a tribunal that could judge, in the name of God, nations and sovereigns, and which could prevent wars and revolutions, this tribunal would be the masterpiece of political wisdom, and the last degree of social perfection." And the world has recently applauded the common sense of this opinion, by actually appealing, in two instances, to the Sovereign Pontiff, to settle quarrels which were on the point of begetting war. It was a curious spectacle, when Spain and Germany were brandishing swords on the question of the possession of the Carolinas Islands, to see Prince Bismarck not only willing to appeal to the Pope, but willing to respect his judgment when unfavorable to him. "If," said Prince Bismarck, "the Pope decides that our pretensions with regard to the Carolinas Islands are not just, I shall not contest with Spain the possession of the Carolinas." So that the head of the Church, who has no army, and only a few acres of garden for his whole territory, has been acknowledged by the master of armies to be the most fitting power to decide questions which involve Christian principles of right and wrong. Now at this point may be urged the objection that, had the Pope been at, say, New York, he would have been equally fit to be consulted on points of morals. Perfectly true—so far as his divine office is concerned. But there are a good many other weighty considerations. Be it remembered that, in the difficult science of the "law of nations,"—now sought to be re-studied

by the civilized world,—there is the necessity of a profound knowledge of lofty subjects, and of taking counsel with the wisest jurists. It was with this conviction that Mr. Urquhart, an earnest Protestant, wrote to the Sovereign Pontiff many years ago, and said: "I beseech you, most Holy Father, that you call forth the lofty and all-pervading intelligence of the Roman Church for the purpose of cultivating this science (of supernatural law), which the ancients denominated 'the science concerned about things human and divine,' and which made pagan Rome so great, so noble, and so venerable." It was at the time of the Vatican Council that the Catholic bishops had urged the establishment of a great school of supernatural law in the city of Rome; and Mr. Urquhart was only expressing, from a Protestant country, the strong desires which the bishops had reported from Catholic countries. Now how could it be possible for such a "school" to be established, under the paternal care and governance of the Supreme Pontiff in any city save only in his own city, or even in that city, unless he were its ruler? Mr. Urquhart's allusion to "pagan Rome" was singularly happy in many ways. It was because in pagan Rome there were thoroughly established schools—"holy institutions," as Bossuet called them, for the consideration of what constituted just wars,—that "the college of *Feciales*" was equally competent and free in the performance of its international obligations. The *jus feciale* in pagan Rome was the fruit of the peaceful labors of the wisest heads. And the same spirit of justice which fathered it, tempered only by loftier Christian ethics, was the spirit of the middle age of Christendom, when the Popes were the acknowledged arbiters of the world's quarrels. But how is international law to be studied, "as an auxiliary to the practice of the Roman Pontiff's mediatorial and judicial office," unless Rome be under the rule of the Pontiff, in all senses in which we use the word "rule"? The fitness of things requires that the Roman Pontiff dwell securely and independently in his own centre. He has to superintend such a variety of institutions, all "auxiliary" to what may be called the Christian science, that his dependence on the caprice of a hostile government must be not only hampering, but fatal. It is fatal. It has been proved so during the last quarter of a century. *A fortiori* must the Pope's banishment from Rome be the banishment of that supreme, vigilant ruler, who has at heart the temporal welfare of the world, only in secondary degree to its spiritual? The Pope needs his counsellors, his assessors, his means of free communication with the whole world. Therefore his "imprisonment" must be injurious to his free action, and his banishment injurious to civilization.

We have only hinted at a few reasons why it must be an offence against Christianity, and an offence against the intellectual sense of fitness, that the Supreme Pastor should dwell anywhere than in his own city, or in that city save only as its sovereign. It has been well suggested that God united the spiritual and the temporal powers in the Sovereign Pontiff, chiefly because they should be disunited in every one else. As long as this great truth was recognized, the civil powers had their best support at Rome, their best defender *because* he taught justice. It is perfectly true that in the Middle Ages, when feudalism was normal, there was a certain rudeness and barbarism in making war (though no one who has studied the modern wars of "enlightened" Europe can call them anything but barbarous in their pretexts, and barbarous in their disregard of just preliminaries), yet since in these days the world is more "armed" than it ever was, more ready for instant onslaught and destruction, there is really *more* reason for the recognition of a supreme arbiter than when fighting was less mechanical and more troublesome. But how can justice appeal to the Supreme Pontiff, when injustice has deprived him of his independence? "*We* are your judges," say the modern revolutionists to the Pontiff whom they have deprived of his sovereignty, "as to your moral rights over the states we have taken from you; how, then, can we ask you to be *our* judge as to our own moral rights or other people's." The world sees this. There is some sign that it will soon act on its conviction. Meanwhile the question is uppermost in the minds of all virtuous statesmen, "How shall peace be best assured in this most military age; and how shall we reconcile the fact that we *must* have a supreme arbiter, with the fact that we are dishonoring Him whom we would all select?"

"Rome," therefore, being the idea of stability, in all senses which any Christian would care to recognize, must be necessarily a fixed, changeless centre, from what may be called "the very nature of things." "Rome" means fixedness. It is the Mount Zion of the Christian dispensation. We cannot remove mountains; and the Holy See is that mountain which God has placed in the Christian world to be its fortress. Has any good ever come to the world from the Pope's leaving Rome? Or has any good ever come to the world from the Pope's being persecuted, from his being treated as a political item or inconvenience? Yet, though we all know that to compel the Pope to leave Rome is both the biggest political and religious blunder, we go to sleep over the monster scandal of contemplating it, or shrug our shoulders at what we mildly call "a mistake." Leo the Thirteenth has rebuked us for so thinking. Six years ago His Holiness wrote: "Let all who love Christendom

understand that it is now time to *begin something* ; it is not a time for indifference and sloth." Such was the Pope's answer to the foolish question : " Will the Pope leave Rome ? " The Pope will never " leave " Rome, though he may be driven out of it ; and Rome, as it is now, is perpetually asking itself the question : " Shall we, Romans, restore to the Pope his own city, which is his by every divine and natural right ? Or shall we go on piling up the curses of revolution, to our own injury and that of the whole of Christendom ? "

THE COLUMBUS CENTENARY OF 1892.

THAT we are to celebrate in this country the discovery of the New World by Christopher Columbus, four hundred years ago, seems settled and determined. New York is apparently to be the spot where the celebration is to be held, and a managing committee of capable, influential men has already been appointed.

The claims for the long prior discovery by the Northmen are swept aside, and there is a general desire to do honor to Christopher Columbus and the results, greater even than he dreamed of, which followed from the memorable voyage, planned and proposed after years of scientific study. The Irish and Northmen, groping along in the Hyperborean seas, discovered the Faroë islands, Iceland, Greenland, and finally land further south, the Vinland and Irland it Mikla. They had no idea that a new continent had been reached ; they were simply extending the limits of Europe, and the earliest maps show their fortuitous discoveries as part of that continent. After the time of the Irish monk Dicuil, no one in the north seems to have made any scientific use of these early discoveries.

Columbus had applied the geographical knowledge acquired up to his time to the study of a route to the Indies by sailing westward. The sphericity of the globe was known and understood, but longitudes were vague ; and his calculation of the distance between the western shores of Europe and the eastern shores of China and farther India was fortunately incorrect. Had he not underrated the distance, he would never have undertaken the voyage or found any to join him. Utterly unconscious of the existence of another continent, he described the lands he discovered

in 1492 as part of India beyond the Ganges. The merit of his voyage lies in the fact that it was based on the best science of his time, was planned to carry out a definite theory and in its results led to a complete knowledge of the earth's surface, revealed by future circumnavigation.

Personally, Christopher Columbus is one of the grand figures of history. A man of study and action, he knew the seas by constant comparison of the geographical works with the maps of the learned and the charts of practical seamen; he knew the seas, too, by actual voyages on the Mediterranean and Atlantic. He was, too, a man of enthusiasm, of deep religious faith, a man convinced that he had a great mission to fulfil. His life was chequered by trials which he bore manfully, by triumphs which filled him with no mean or vain ostentation, by adversities which he bore with unrepining submission to the designs of Providence, the noblest characteristic of a Christian.

His discovery changed the conditions of the world. As his great work was carried on and developed by others, new states arose on the continent he revealed; a new Europe, gradually rivalling the old in population, arts, science and learning, becomes a mighty element in human affairs, and men retaining the languages of Europe, glorying in its literature, its civilization, enjoy happiness and freedom that seemed impossible elsewhere.

With our vast republic traversing the great continent, increasing in all material prosperity, the people of the United States may well celebrate with gratitude to Almighty God the voyage of Christopher Columbus in 1492.

In the proposed exposition our people will bring together the products of our mines, our forests and our cultured fields; the fabrics of our looms, the articles wrought by factory and forge and machine shop, models of public buildings for legislation, education and charity; models of wonderful bridges and aqueducts; the thousand inventions in which the genius of men and women in this land seems prolific beyond that of any other time or country; instruments of most delicate construction for the man of science, the surgeon, or other professional worker.

Other and older lands will send their exhibits to show that we have not yet acquired superiority in all departments, and set some bounds to a national pride that may become overweening and unbearable. It promises to be one of the greatest of these expositions, worthy of our country and its object.

But is this exposition to be simply material? Is it to show the results of the human mind only as applied to matter, and seeking to meet material wants? Surely the exposition should bear some testimony to man's higher nature, to intellectual progress, and more

than all to bear testimony to the Christian faith in the land. Surely it ought not to be a mere tribute to materialism ; there should be something to bear witness to man's spiritual nature—to Christianity.

Already some denominations have proposed to contribute exhibits which will show the results of their missions among heathen nations. This assures us that the Christian element is not to be overlooked and excluded, and we cannot deny that it is a step in the right direction. There has been too great a tendency to unchristianize the land, to carry out the strange statement made in our early treaties with the Barbary States, that our government was not based on Christianity or Christian law.

But if Protestant denominations, singly or acting together, are to make exhibits of their missionary efforts in foreign lands, present curiosities sent home by their missionaries, exhibit the bibles and devotional works which have been published to win or retain converts, if they show their progress here, and the results of their labors, we can but approve their zeal.

If the Bible Society and similar organizations, sustained by a number of Protestant denominations, have space assigned for the exhibits of their works, we have no word of condemnation.

But if these bodies, separately or collectively, are to appear in the great Columbus Exposition of 1892, there certainly can be nothing obtrusive or irregular in the Catholic Church proposing to have its exhibit also. More than perhaps all others we may modestly ask for recognition. The very occasion commemorating a Catholic event, our antiquity, the early date when our labors began in this country, our present numbers, our exertions in the cause of morality and education, all plead our cause. Nor can we suppose that it will be denied. But if the Columbus Exposition of 1892, whether held at New York or elsewhere, is to be open to the Church, it behooves the Catholic body to place there some tangible evidence of its vitality, its influence, its accomplished work and present efforts in the cause of Christianity and civilization. Our right to appear none can gainsay. Columbus was, above all, a Catholic. Every impulse was guided by a religious sense. He proposed to devote all the wealth he might acquire by his discoveries to the great work of rescuing the sepulchre of Christ from the hands of the Moslem. Alas! the very year of the fourth centenary of his discovery, a pilgrimage from the continent he discovered finds the Holy Land still in the hands of the followers of Mahomet. Columbus showed through life a love of religion, and a desire to practise its obligations. He was enrolled, in youth, in a Catholic sodality, and later in life became a member of the Third Order of St. Francis. When Viceroy of the

Indies and Admiral of the Ocean, he wore a Franciscan robe, not the garb of a courtier bedecked with the insignia of his exalted rank that engendered envy in meaner minds. Columbus was not only pre-eminently a devoted son of the Catholic Church, living and dying in her communion, but his merit is such that hundreds of Catholic bishops have petitioned the Holy See to permit the cause of his canonization to be introduced, that the Church, in her slow, cautious, and careful way, may order investigation into his life, and decide whether he practised the virtues in such a heroic way that he may be proposed to the faithful as a model. The exposition intended to honor such a Catholic hero has, then, a peculiar interest to Catholics, and, above all, to the faithful in any part of the New World which he revealed to Europe.

Columbus belongs to us. From his baptism in a Catholic church to his interment in the Franciscan chapel at Valladolid, he is ours. His remains now, whether they be really still in Saint Domingo or in Havana, lie within the consecrated walls of a Catholic church.

Even for this land of ours we cannot be overlooked. Pineda, who discovered the mouth of the Mississippi, and named it in honor of the Holy Ghost; the pious Marquette, who threaded it for so great a distance, and dedicated it to the Immaculate Conception; the missionary Hennepin, who ascended to the falls which he named in honor of Saint Anthony of Padua, were all Catholics. Ponce de Leon, who named Florida to commemorate its discovery on the great feast of the Resurrection; Ayllon, who named the Carolinas the Land of St. John the Baptist, and bestowed on the Chesapeake the name of Saint Mary, Mother of God; the navigators who named cape, and river, and promontory, and bay from the Catholic calendar, from the river of Saint John to the river of Saint Lawrence, were all Catholics. New Mexico bears the name given by a Catholic missionary three centuries ago.

The settlement of Maryland was due to the zeal and judgment of Sir George Calvert, Lord Baltimore, who took up and carried out the earlier projects of Catholic settlement formed by the bravest Englishman of his time, Sir Thomas Arundell, of Wardour, whose prowess won him on the continent the coronet of an earl, though England recognized his merit only by the lowest rank of nobility, that of baron.

The singular wisdom, tolerance, and justice embodied by Lord Baltimore in the charter which he obtained of the king, and which are evinced by no similar provisions on charters granted by that monarch, stamp Calvert as one of the noblest legislators and greatest friends of humanity. He founded a colony which prospered under his rule, as wise and practicable as that devised by the phil-

osopher Locke for Carolina was utopian and unpracticable. Maryland became the home of civil and religious liberty, the only one in the wide world. The example and the acts of the first and second Lords Baltimore, of Leonard Calvert, the first governor of the province, and of the Catholic gentlemen who carried out the planting of the Land of the Sanctuary, place them in a noble and conspicuous position among all the American colonizers for their liberality, their industry, their prudence, their wise and just treatment of the Indians.

These founders of a noble state will ever be the pride of American Catholics, and attempts to detract from their glory only serve to make their memory more illustrious. The proposed statue of Cecil Calvert may well be one of the exhibits of the exposition. But we are not restricted to Maryland. The Land of the Sanctuary is not the only state that had a Catholic founder, and in claiming this we refer to actual enduring settlement, not to projects which failed at their birth, like the French and Spanish attempts in South Carolina, or the early French and English colonization schemes in Maine; nor to missions created by our dauntless missionaries among the Indian tribes. Among real founders of colonies which have grown to be states, or are seeking admission in that capacity into the Union, are Don Pedro Menendez de Aviles, founder of Florida; Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac, founder of Michigan; the Sieur de Vincennes, founder of Indiana; La Salle, founder of Illinois; St. Ange, founder of Missouri; Tonti, of Arkansas; Iberville, of Louisiana; Sauvolle, of Mississippi; Bienville, of Mobile; Don Juan de Oñate, founder of New Mexico; Don Andres de Pes, of Texas; Don Gaspar de Portola, of California.

Of the adventurous men who threaded rivers, climbed mountains, traversed pathless plains amid a thousand dangers, we can claim Champlain, who has left his name to a lake in New York; Perrot and Nicolet on the upper lakes; Louis Joliet. Robert Cavelier de la Salle, La Verendrye, Coronado, Font and Garces, Kühn, Saint Denys. By these men the valley of the great lakes, the valley of the Mississippi, and the plains to the Gulf of California were made known before English colonists had any definite knowledge of the land beyond the Alleghanies.

The land teems with memorials of our Catholic pioneers; the missionary Le Moyne discovered the salt springs of Onondaga; the Franciscan Joseph de la Roche d'Allion the oil springs of Pennsylvania; Jesuits discovered the copper of Lake Superior and the lead of Illinois; a Jesuit identified the ginseng, and a Catholic physician first employed the sarracenia; Hennepin was one of the first to note our beds of coal; Father Marc, the mines of the

turquoise. Catholics were the first explorers, geologists, and botanists of this part of the New World.

They did this while threading the wilderness to carry to the native tribes the truths of Christianity and raise them from heathen degradation. The Catholic priest was the first to offer Christian worship to Almighty God within the limits of the United States. The churches of St. Augustine and of New Mexico out-date all others in the country, and were filled with worshippers before an English settlement existed on the coast. The first Christian missionaries to the Indians in Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, Maryland, New York, Maine, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, Louisiana, and the country from the Mississippi to the Pacific were Catholic priests. To their writings we owe the most valuable information as to the native tribes, their language, religion, government, and customs. The earth holds the remains of more than fifty who died glorious martyrs to their zeal in spreading the Gospel.

In an exposition that proposes to show the progress from 1492 to our own time, the Catholic Church is therefore entitled to a place. It may seem to some rather difficult for a church to make an exhibit, but the difficulty is more apparent than real.

Personal relics of Columbus may, perhaps, be obtained; some volumes noted by him from the Columbian library at Seville; copies of his account of the great voyage, printed at Rome or in Spain, can certainly be had; a memorial from the convent of La Rabida, tenanted still by Franciscans, as it was when Columbus knocked at the door to obtain shelter. Search made in the Vatican archives now open to scholars, a search which His Holiness, Leo XIII., will encourage, may bring to light some report or letter of the great discoverer which has been slumbering for centuries around the yellowing documents of the 15th century. There will be no difficulty in filling a Columbus case, and surely it will be one not only in harmony with the project, but almost requisite.

With the Columbus relics will come the earliest maps and charts showing the progress of Catholic discoverers, the Verazzani, the Ribera, the Cabot, and other maps; the remarkable copper globes preserved in the New York Historical Society and in the Lenox Library, one of which was dedicated to and owned by Cardinal Marcellus Cervini, who was subsequently elected Pope under the name of Marcellus II.

We need not even take in the whole continent of America, or even the whole of the northern portion, for material multiplies as we advance towards our own times. The collection should be restricted to material relating directly to the territory now inclosed

within the limits of the United States, and in which, as Americans and as Catholics, we can claim a heritage.

Portraits and memorials of Catholic founders of States, of early Catholic pioneers and missionaries, Menendez, Calvert, Arundell, La Salle, Iberville, Jogues, Margil and others, maps of discoveries, views of important scenes, will all be in harmony with the general idea.

Relics collected from the ancient churches and mission sites of the country, from Florida, New Mexico, Texas, California, from northern mission and church sites in Maine, Ohio, Illinois and the West, medals, crucifixes, chalices, the Perrot Ostensorium, the ancient bread iron from Mackinac, ancient vestments, articles from Bishops' Memorial Hall, of Notre Dame University, Indiana, all these would form a collection to interest thousands visiting the exposition, and would reflect credit on the Church.

A book-case might contain many a work that would speak eloquently of Catholic labors. The earliest separate work on New Mexico, the "Relation" printed at Rome before Virginia or New England had a settler; the work of Benavides; the Catholic Sir George Peckham's "True Account," and Weymouth's "Voyage," worth their weight many a time in gold; the printed accounts of the earliest attempts to form Catholic-English settlements in America; White's "Journal" and the first Maryland "Relation," relics from Georgetown College of Lord Baltimore and the settlement of St. Mary's; the famous charter of the province and the first printed copy of the noble Toleration Act of 1649; the Duke's Laws of New York; the charter of the City of New York, granted by a Catholic governor, under a Catholic lord proprietor; Thevenot's edition of the voyage of Father Marquette and Sieur Joliet; Cabeza de Vaca's "Shipwrecks;" the first printed histories of Florida, Louisiana, California; the parish registry of St. Augustine, dating back to 1591; those of Illinois, beginning somewhat later; of Detroit and Mobile; autograph letters of early Catholic pioneers and missionaries; works of early Catholic botanists like Plumier, Sarrazin, Lafitau, Charlevoix, making known the flora of this country. All these would form a collection of immense value and full of interest to every student and antiquarian; a collection that would excite wonder even in the most indifferent visitor. With them could be placed the earliest epic relating to the country and written in the country, the poem of Captain Villagr , one of the conquistadores of New Mexico, published before the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock.

To bring together the works of earlier Catholic writers, who treated incidentally of the Indians and mission work among them, would require space for a large library; but even if the collection

were limited to books on Indian languages of the United States, written by missionaries, or works printed in those languages, the catalogue would be a long one. Beginning with the works in the Timuquan language of Florida, by Father Francis Pareja, O.S.F., printed between 1612 and 1627, including a grammar, catechism, prayers; Sagard's Wyandot Dictionary, 1632; Father White's books on the Maryland language, written soon after 1634; Bruyas' Mohawk works, the Onondaga Dictionary, Garnier's Seneca and Cayuga books; R  le's Abnaki Dictionary; Le Boulanger's Illinois Dictionary and Catechism; Garcia's Texan Manual, 1760; the works of Sitjar, Cuesta and other California missionaries, with the labors of Bishop Baraga, Mengarini, Marcoux, Pandosy, Gailand, D'Herbomez, and other missionaries in our own days, the student of American linguistics has the richest and most valuable material.

Views of the only style of Catholic chapel-house permitted by law in Maryland before the Revolution, such as that still standing at Deer Creek in Harford County, or that near Wye Mills on the Eastern Shore, would attract attention as contrasted with the grand Catholic cathedrals of to-day.

To represent the growth of the Church since the establishment of the hierarchy in 1789, a set of autograph letters of the Archbishops and Bishops, from Archbishop Carroll down, would be appreciated generally, with some few mementoes of the most illustrious bishops, priests, religious women and laymen.

The exhibit of our educational and eleemosynary institutions ought to be ample and instructive. Our colleges, academies, and schools, although they number nearly four thousand, are so persistently ignored by the Bureau of Education, and by state reports, or mentioned only in brief and slighting terms, that a careful exhibit becomes necessary. They have grown in spite of opposition and discouragements, but, like the camomile, seem to thrive when trampled on. To some it may appear difficult to make a satisfactory exhibit of education. Some of our parochial schools are models in architectural solidity, in arrangements for ventilation and light, as well as in precautions against fire, no less than in the best appliances for aiding the pupils in their studies. These form one topic. The exhibit made by the Brothers of the Christian Schools at the New Orleans exposition show their mode of teaching, and its results in the progress and skill attained by pupils can be made clear to every one. Similar exhibits of our parochial school system might be contributed from different parts of the country, and a selection made by a committee of what could be offered to the exposition. Our higher colleges and academies can present evidences of classical, literary and scientific training. Every col-

lege can within the next three years create among the students an organization like the Toner circle, at Georgetown University, and thus stimulate collegians to make and describe collections gathered within the State in which the institution is situated, representing the Indian antiquities, minerals, fossils, trees, plants, birds, animals, fish, insects, etc., of the State; they can present the result of scientific, chemical, electrical and photographic experiments; architectural and mechanical or ornamental designs and models; evidences of many kinds that will attest how in our Catholic institutions sound learning in literature is given, while art in all its branches, and the multifarious departments of science, are so well inculcated as to show in the pupils a hearty appreciation and the cultivation of a taste for increasing by all lawful means the well-being of the people of the Republic for time and eternity.

There are other topics to which we might allude, but as this is a matter of suggestion, rather than an exhaustive essay, we need not enter on them. Our actual work among the Indians and negroes is a department in which much might be presented.

A Church which reared its first altar on this soil as far back as 1521, which has three and three-quarter centuries of active and persistent work to illustrate, beginning in the next decade after the death of Columbus, is certainly entitled to a place in the centennial exposition in honor of Columbus and his discovery. No other denomination of Christians can claim priority or equal duration; no other can show such heroic missionary efforts to rescue the native tribes from heathen superstition; no other endured in colonial days such unmerited and prolonged persecution for justice's sake; no other, at this moment, is making such sacrifices for the cause of education among all classes. The claim of the Catholic Church is, then, a peculiar one, and it ought to meet no opposition from the managers of the exposition. Her exhibit will be thoroughly American, connected with the history of the country from the earliest attempts at settlement, and such a one as has never yet been proposed, much less seen, in any exposition here or abroad.

To ensure success, however, there must be prompt, harmonious, and continuous action on our part. The exhibit must be presented so strongly to those in control of the exposition as to meet all objections; and, if consent is given, the exhibit must be such on our part as not to involve those gentlemen in censure, or make Catholics feel that the exhibit is inadequate and not just to the Church, to our country, or the illustrious discoverer whom we all intend to honor.

The great gathering of prelates, clergy, and laity, of religious orders and secular priests, at Baltimore next month to commemorate the erection of a hierarchy in this republic a century ago, when

scattered and isolated churches were organized into one body instinct with life, affords a grand opportunity for bringing this subject forward and adopting plans to carry it out.

The idea may be regarded by some as a novel one, the sketch here given imperfect and crude; but if sanctioned as wise by the ecclesiastical authorities of the Church, and taken up in earnest by the Catholic gentlemen who will gather around the cathedral commenced by the patriot Carroll, abler minds will give the project a more definite and symmetrical form, and able hands be selected to carry it into execution.

It does seem, however, that the occasion so linked with a great Catholic hero, and contemporaneous with the celebration of the event by Catholic Spain and the territory in America that still obeys her rule, or preserves her language in republican states, ought to find the great Catholic body in the United States, now forming a fifth of the whole population, alive to the demands of the hour, and prepared to show the country and the civilized world what Catholicity has accomplished and is doing in this fair land of ours.

We would do it not invidiously as drawing distinctions, not in a spirit of vain glory, but from the very necessity of our position. We have been so much isolated from the rest of the people by the iron wall of prejudice that relegates us to a kind of helotage, that in the literature, the educational management, the charitable work, we are treated almost as if non-existent. Many denominations act together for common ends, and always do so as against the Church. They believe or seem to believe that they alone are Americans, and that Catholics have no claim to the title or the rights which it represents. The very Catholicity which makes the Church embrace men of all countries and races in one brotherhood is made almost a crime; and a narrow and exclusive national spirit, utterly at variance with the true spirit of Christianity, is exalted into a kind of virtue.

As the oldest, the most widespread, the most numerous organization in the country, with arms open to receive all without distinction, doing good for religion and morality, for loyalty and devotion to country, bearing without retaliation contumely and wrong, the Catholic body has certainly some claims, and if properly and eloquently presented they will be recognized by the great body of the American people.

THE FACULTY OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

A FEW weeks hence the Catholic University of America will be an accomplished fact. Thanks to the tireless energy of its Chancellor, Cardinal Gibbons, and of its Right Reverend Rector, aided by the vigorous support of the American Episcopate, seed-time will be speedily followed by harvest. Only five years have passed since the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore officially inaugurated the movement for the establishment of the University. In the spring of 1887 the Holy Father sanctioned the project and urged its immediate realization. Shortly after, Bishop Keane was appointed Rector Magnificus and entrusted with the work of organizing the new school. Not a moment was lost. Now in the East, now in the West, he and his zealous co-workers pleaded the cause of learning and religion. Enthusiasm begets enthusiasm. Liberal contributions poured in from laymen and clerics, from individuals and associations, such as the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, which has voted \$50,000 to endow a chair in honor of Father Mathew. To-day nearly a million of dollars has been subscribed and secure the financial success of the theological department of the University. After careful consideration and lengthy debate, Washington was chosen as the most suitable home of the new school of learning. Immediately plans for the buildings contemplated were called for and a selection made. On the twenty-fourth of May, 1888, the corner-stone of the divinity school was laid; and in the coming month of November, just a hundred years after the consecration of John Carroll, the first Catholic bishop of the great American Republic, the first Catholic University will open its gates for the admission of its first students.

Surely the success of the undertaking from a material point of view has been brilliant; but the founders and promoters of the University, whilst looking after its material interests, did not lose sight of the far more important intellectual side of the enterprise. They fully realized that bricks and stones and mortar do not constitute a school of learning; that costly buildings are not always symbolic of scholarship and intellectual excellence. Hence the newly-appointed rector did not devote all his activity to the gathering of the sinews of war. Once and again he crossed the ocean to study the various European university systems. In Italy, in Germany, in France, in England, he sought for light and advice on the vital question of the literary and scientific organization of the school entrusted to his care. Like the old Roman, the modern

American is not too stupid to see what is good abroad, nor too conceited to adopt it. Thus a plan of studies, based on gradually ripening experience, was adopted by the trustees of the University, and approved, with slight modifications, by the Supreme Pontiff. Again, amidst their manifold cares, the trustees never forgot the importance of a solid and comprehensive library of standard works. A school of learning without such a library is a workshop without tools. The selection and gathering of the books was confided to Dr. Corrigan, the learned Archbishop of New York, and he, with the aid of Dr. Messmer, has already built up a library fully adequate to present wants, and comprising all that is most important in theological literature, ancient and modern. But more than anything else the question of a competent faculty, a faculty worthy of the first Catholic American university and of the high ideal of its founders, absorbed the attention of its guides and managers. With open eyes and prudent care they went to work. They studied first their own needs, and then they scanned the academic world far and near to discover men who bade fair as scholars and as instructors to answer their needs and to compel the respect of the learned at home and abroad. All the chairs have not yet been filled. "Make haste slowly" has been the motto of the trustees and their counsellors; still, enough appointments have been made to foreshadow the character of the future faculty. Their names were announced several months ago. We shall here give brief sketches of the prelates and scholars destined to guide the beginnings of the Washington University.

The chancellor of the University is the Archbishop of Baltimore, Cardinal Gibbons. His career is too well known to need rehearsal here. Suffice it to say that his learning, his ability, his virtues, his untiring industry and unpretentious affability have won for him the hearts of all that know him. An American by birth, he is no less an American by sympathy. In this he is a true type of the American Catholic, for there are no more sincere lovers of our country and its free institutions than Catholic Americans, lay and clerical, native and naturalized. The Cardinal has been a successful author, his work entitled "The Faith of our Fathers" having passed through many editions and met with the warm approval of competent critics. It has also been translated into several foreign languages. A new work, we are assured, may shortly be expected from his pen. The new chancellor, therefore, is not only an eminent dignitary of the Church, but likewise a scholar, whose literary sympathies and success fit him for the headship of the new seat of learning. Many are his claims to distinction, as a zealous priest, industrious scholar, energetic bishop, primate of the great American Republic and Prince of the Church; and yet,

perhaps, future times may honor him above all as the first chancellor of the Catholic University of America.

Bishop Keane, the rector of our University, has for a long time been no stranger to American Catholics; since he became identified with the Catholic University his name has become familiar to all Americans. He is in the vigor of manhood, having just completed his fiftieth year. Though not born in the United States, he is an American by training and feeling; he was but seven years old when he came to this country. Here he received his literary and theological education, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1866. Washington, the future home of Rector Keane, was also the field of his first labors as a priest. From 1866 to 1878 he was connected with St. Patrick's church, beloved and admired for the faithful and intelligent performance of his priestly duties. His success in Washington marked him out for a larger sphere of activity, and in 1878 he succeeded Cardinal Gibbons as Bishop of Richmond, Virginia. When called to the rectorship of the University he resigned his see, in order to devote himself without reserve to his academical work. His eloquent appeals for the new institution have been heard from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and he has pleaded his chosen cause with equal ardor in the old world and the new. He has studied the organization of the most famous Catholic universities in Europe, not from books only, but by personal inspection. In the course of these studies he has visited Rome, Vienna, Innsbruck, Munich, Münster, Louvain, Paris, and other seats of learning; without prejudice he has inquired and investigated, marked the weak and strong points everywhere, approved and admired, but never forgot that his university, whilst as Catholic as the most Catholic of the ancient schools, was destined to be the *alma mater* of American students destined to labor among American citizens on the soil of the American Republic. Bishop Keane is a well equipped theologian, an eloquent speaker, and a man of action.

To aid Bishop Keane in his executive duties, the trustees have selected the Reverend Dr. Philip J. Garrigan, with the title of Vice-Rector. Dr. Garrigan is a man just past forty, and comes from the diocese of Springfield, Massachusetts. Having made his classical studies at St. Charles' College, near Baltimore, he entered Troy Seminary as a theologian; there he was raised to the priesthood in 1869. How favorable was the impression made by him as a student at Troy appears from the fact that only a few years after his ordination (1873) he was called to assume the responsible position of director at his theological *alma mater*. In fulfilling the duties of this office, which brought him in the closest contact with the students, he gave eminent satisfaction. Dr. Garrigan is a man

of method, precision and discernment, combining great kindness with common sense, qualities that markedly fit him for executive work. In 1876 he resigned his position in Troy to devote himself to the care of souls. He became pastor of St. Bernard's church at Fitchburg, Massachusetts, where his work was blessed with the same success that attended him at Troy. Here he remained until he was called to assume the vice-rectorship of the new University. During Bishop Keane's frequent absences its interests at Washington were confided to Dr. Garrigan, and his practical sense and his vigor proved equal to all the demands made on him. Shortly after his appointment as vice-rector, Rome conferred on him the doctor's hat.

Dr. Joseph Schroeder will be the professor of dogmatic theology. Prof. Schroeder is in the flower of his years, a man whose strong, open countenance and vigorous physique betoken great intellectual power and a capacity for hard work. He was born in 1849 near Aix-la-Chapelle in Rhenish Prussia. After completing his academical studies at the Gymnasium of Reusz in his native province, he decided to devote himself to the priesthood. Accordingly in 1867 he entered the German College at Rome. After a three years' course of philosophy and a four years' course of theology, he distinguished himself by passing most successful public examinations in both these sciences, and the doctor's hat was awarded to him amid the hearty applause of all present. Having been raised to the priesthood, he was now (1874) to return to Germany. But meantime the "Kulturkampf" had broken out. Like many other young German priests, he was forbidden by the "May Laws" to exercise the ministry and forced to choose between idleness and exile. His choice was soon made. Without delay he accepted a call from Monseigneur de Montpellier, Bishop of Liège in Belgium, who appointed him professor of Latin and Greek literature in the Seminary of Saint Trond. Before long he was transferred to the chair of philosophy, which he filled until 1887. At that time, thanks to the wisdom of Leo XIII. and the political needs of the Iron Chancellor, the "Kulturkampf" was abandoned, the "May Laws" were repealed in part, and Catholics handled, not with Bismarck's iron hand, but with Von Gossler's velvet glove. So Dr. Schroeder returned to his Fatherland and was appointed pastor of the Church of St. John the Baptist at Cologne. But important and honorable as was this position, he was soon called away to resume his professional work. In 1888 the Cologne Seminary lost its professor of dogmatic theology, Dr. M. Scheeben, one of the foremost scholars of Catholic Germany. Only a man of profound learning and a successful teacher could fill the gap made by his death. On surveying the field, Archbishop Krentz of Cologne

selected the new pastor of St. John's as worthy of Scheeben's mantle; after presiding for one year (September, 1887, to September, 1888) over his parish, he took the chair of dogma and morals at Cologne. When Cardinal Lavigerie started his anti-slavery movement, it was taken up with fiery ardor by the Catholics of the Fatherland. Dr. Schroeder threw himself into the midst of the movement, and much of its work rests on his shoulders. He is the general secretary of the German Catholic Anti-Slavery Society. Aside from his standing as a theologian, our professor of dogma is a man of marked and manifold accomplishments. As a linguist he is not only a master of the classical tongues, but has a ready and perfect control of several modern languages. German, French, and Italian he speaks and writes with equal fluency and correctness; when we say "speaks," we mean not only "converses," but speaks as an orator; for Dr. Schroeder is a powerful and logical public speaker. At the great national conventions of Catholic Germany, held at Aix-la-Chapelle, Bonn, Düsseldorf, and Münster, he shone as an orator alongside of such men as Heinrich, Lieber, Von Heere-mann and Windthorst. As a writer, too, he has worked vigorously and successfully. Whilst residing in Belgium he wrote in French a refutation of the ultra-liberal views of M. Romain, besides contributing to several of the best Belgian periodicals. In German he wrote a work entitled: "Liberalism in Theology and History," besides articles in literary and theological papers. He has especially been a frequent writer for the Cologne *Pastoral Gazette*. Such are Dr. Schroeder's intellectual and scientific accomplishments. To these he joins a personal character of singular attractiveness, prominent among his many amiable qualities being an unselfish, self-sacrificing charity. Quite recently the Holy Father has appointed Dr. Schroeder private honorary Chamberlain, with the title of Monsignor.

One of the most important branches of learning in every divinity school is Biblical science. Of late years this department has witnessed many new developments. The decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphics and of the Assyrian cuneiform writing has opened up new sources of oriental history, and thrown light on many points more or less obscure in our Old Testament narratives. But the discoveries thus made have also been used by rationalist scholars to discredit the authority of Holy Scripture, and, in fact, all religion. The modern professor of Scripture, therefore, has a much broader field before him than his predecessors; besides the old learning and the old methods, he must handle much new material and deal with critical methods unknown a generation ago. Besides Hebrew, he must have mastered the Egyptian and Assyrian, or, at least, be acquainted with the last results obtained by

Egyptologists and Assyriologists. A competent knowledge of Arabic and Syriac, not to speak of other Eastern languages, if not absolutely necessary, will be very useful to him. Lastly, he must be familiar with Eastern customs and life, for much light has been thrown on many facts and incidents recorded in Holy Writ by a deeper knowledge of Eastern geography and customs and manners. Fortunately, from the very beginning, especially in France, Catholic savants have been among the pioneers of these important and interesting researches. We need only mention the names of Champollion, who deciphered the hieroglyphs; of Chabas, Lenormant, De Vogüé, and latterly of M. Robiou, to show how large a share Catholic laymen have had in these new conquests of science and scholarship. But the clergy, too, have been forward in this new intellectual field, and the Sulpician Abbé Vigouroux, the Abbé Loisy and the Jesuit Fathers Strassmeier, Van der Gheyn and Delattre, have compelled even their rationalist *confrères* to acknowledge their keenness and their acquirements. It is one of the most prominent disciples of the Abbé Vigouroux, Dr. Hyvernât, that Bishop Keane has secured for the Washington University. Like most of the savants eminent in these studies, he is comparatively a young man. But already he has attracted the attention of foreign orientalists, for not long ago the London *Academy*, a journal making oriental studies a specialty, published a letter in which he detailed some of the results of the scientific journey which he is just now making in Egypt, Arabia and Syria. A native of Lyons, in southern France, and a pupil of the Sulpicians in Paris, he continued at Rome the studies to which he intends to devote his life. If youth, vigor, and enthusiasm, coupled with a quick and penetrating mind, are a presage of success, the university may justly be congratulated on the acquisition of Dr. Hyvernât.

How keenly alive to the modern and American requirements of the new seat of learning its trustees have been, is well illustrated by the establishment of a chair of English literature in its divinity school. Mr. Charles Warren Stoddard is to fill this important position. He needs no introduction to the American public, for his name has a good ring in American literature. Born at Rochester, N. Y., in the year 1843, he felt the divine fire of poetry from an early age, for he was only twenty-four years old when he published his first volume of "Poems," at San Francisco, in 1867. His education, begun in New York city, was completed in California, where he went with his father in 1855. In 1864 he went to the Hawaiian Islands, which proved so attractive that they became almost a second home. However, his literary and journalistic abilities were not forgotten in California. In 1873, he was commissioned by the San Francisco *Chronicle* as its travelling correspondent, and as such

he visited many of the South Sea islands, besides Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Pacific slope from Alaska to Mexico, everywhere studying the land and the people, everywhere gathering stores of knowledge. This literary excursion lasted five years. There are few branches of literature that Prof. Stoddard has not, at some time, touched and, we may add, adorned. Besides the volume of poems mentioned above, he published his "South Sea Idyls" at Boston in 1873. This was followed by a descriptive volume entitled "Mashallah: a Flight into Egypt" (New York, 1881). Four years later he sent a thrill of sympathy through the hearts of his countrymen by his pathetic story of the "Lepers of Molokai." Nor is he less well known as a magazine writer. He has been a frequent contributor to most of the leading magazines East and West, and his articles have always proved attractive. For a short time Mr. Stoddard graced the dramatic stage, and afterwards scored a marked success as a lecturer. Latterly he turned his attention to teaching, and in 1885-86 Notre Dame University, Indiana, secured his valued services as professor of English literature. In Prof. Stoddard the Washington University has found a teacher of experience accustomed to set forth his views not only on paper, but on the platform; a man who can both criticize and create; a student not only of many books, but of many men and many cities. Prof. Stoddard is a convert.

The disciplinary control of the students of the university will be in the hands of an officer called the director, who will be a member of the academic senate, in other words, of the faculty. Long ago the University Commission had determined to entrust this important department to the Sulpician Fathers, a society founded for and devoted especially to the training of candidates for the holy ministry. How worthily these sons of the venerable Jean Jacques Olier have fulfilled their lofty mission, even so pronounced an enemy of the Church as M. Renan has borne witness. His "Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse" is, in many ways, a monument to the piety, the religious fervor, the honesty, and the learning of the Sulpicians. It is a member of this society of secular priests, reared in its mother house at Paris, honored by the most important trusts, for years a member of its faculty, an educator of many years' experience, a theologian thought worthy of teaching dogma and morals in one of the greatest seminaries in France, the Abbé Hogan, who will be the director of the Washington University. Dr. Hogan is an Irishman, born in 1829. Having completed his classical studies in his native land, he was sent, in his fifteenth year, to Bordeaux and Paris to study philosophy and theology. In France, as in Ireland, he became distinguished by his brilliant scholarship. When he had finished his theological course at St. Sulpice, he joined the

worthy band of holy and learned men whom he had learned to love and admire as his professors, and who, in turn, welcomed him to their ranks as one eminently fit to be the associate of their holy work. For thirty years he taught among them, at first as professor of dogmatic theology, but, for the greater part of the time, as professor of morals. He also, at various times, worked in other fields of theological learning. When, in 1884, Archbishop Williams opened his new seminary at Brighton, he invited Dr. Hogan to take charge of it as its president. Since then Boston has been the scene of his labors, and a busy toiler he has been; for, besides attending to the executive duties of the head of the seminary, he has filled the chairs of Sacred Scripture and homiletics. His long experience, both as student and professor, and a lifetime spent among young Levites, more than justify Dr. Hogan's choice for the position of disciplinary director of the divinity school.

In providing for the department of philosophy, the heads of the University have in a special manner shown their practical American instincts. The scientific discoveries of the 19th century could not fail to exert a strong influence on philosophical speculation. The atomic theory of the chemists, Darwinism, the theory of evolution, are only some of the many modern scientific hypotheses that modified or conflicted with philosophical views held for centuries. It is plain that a scholar who is a trained scientist, as well as a profound philosophical student and thinker, has unusual qualifications for a professor of philosophy in our days. Such a scholar the managers of the University have found in Dr. Joseph Pohle. Born, like Dr. Schroeder, on the banks of the Rhine, Prof. Pohle has completed his thirty-seventh year. His physique combines the refinement of a scholar with the vigor of a man in the bloom of his years. Having gone through the high school of Boppard, he was enrolled as a student of the gymnasium at Treves in 1866, and is said to have outstripped all his fellow-students as a scholar. His superior merit gained for him a scholarship in the German College at Rome, where he attended the Gregorian University from 1871 to 1879. There he received the degrees of doctor of philosophy, doctor of theology, and licentiate in canon law. After his ordination we find him studying the natural sciences at the University of Würzburg, where he enjoyed the friendship and advice of the celebrated botanist, Prof. Sachs. Having thus rounded off his education and prepared himself for the professor's chair, he found the "Kulturkampf" a bar to his exercising the sacred ministry in his native country. He was allowed neither to preach nor to teach. But distinguished talent need never lie fallow. For several years he was professor in Switzerland, and in 1888 he was called to England to teach morals and dogma in the diocesan seminary of

Leeds, where he immediately gained golden opinions on all sides. But he did not stay long in England. As soon as the episcopal seminaries were re-opened in Germany, by Bismarck's partial repeal of the Falk laws, Dr. Kopp, then Bishop of Fulda, summoned him to teach in his re-established seminary. There he will remain until his duties call him to Washington. A successful teacher, Dr. Pohle has been equally successful as an author. In 1883 he published a biography of the great Jesuit astronomer, F. Angelo Secchi, which was followed in 1884-89 by a work on "Star-Worlds and their Inhabitants," in two volumes. The reputation gained for him by these works forced on him increased literary activity. His proven merits as a reliable scholar and writer induced Cardinal Hergenroether and Dr. Kaulen, his successor in the editorship of the second edition of the great "Church Lexicon" of Wetzer and Welte, to secure him as one of the chief contributors to that monument of German Catholic scholarship. For the "Political Lexicon" of the Goerres Society Prof. Pohle has written many notable articles. Recently he and Dr. Gutberlet of Fulda have been made the joint editors of the "Philosophical Year Book" of the Goerres Society, an annual recording the progress of philosophy and giving reviews of the most remarkable philosophical works published every year. The Goerres Society,—let us say by way of parenthesis,—so named after the great journalist and philosopher, Joseph Goerres, is an association aiming to encourage Catholic authors on the one side and to be helpful to educated Catholics on the other, by undertaking the publication of useful works, the printing of which the ordinary publisher would be unlikely to undertake. The "Year Book of Philosophy" is an example in point. Nothing can be more helpful to the thinking priest and the educated Catholic than a work setting forth exhaustively in a moderate compass the philosophical movement of the age; still it might be very difficult to find a publisher ready to undertake the risk of publishing a work that must appeal to a limited circle of readers. If Prof. Pohle's residence among us will result in the successful establishment of an association with aims similar to those of the Goerres Society, with which he is so closely identified, his beneficial influence outside of the Washington Divinity School will be as great as it is sure to be inside.

The rapid growth of the Church in the United States, and the more normal organization which has been the consequence of that growth, has given an importance to canon law little dreamed of thirty years ago. Hence canon law will be one of the prominent subjects taught in the University. It goes without saying that the lecturer on this subject, to be really helpful to his hearers, must be familiar with the civil law of the United States, and have a

comprehensive knowledge of the peculiar circumstances which environ the Church in our great Republic. The trustees of the university have accordingly appointed to this chair a scholar thoroughly acquainted with our country and the condition of the Church in the United States, Dr. Sebastian Gebhard Messmer. Dr. Messmer was born near St. Gall, in Switzerland, on the 27th of August, 1847, and from early childhood was distinguished for his piety and love of learning. On completing his course in the *Realschule* of Roeschach, near his native place, he entered the *petit séminaire* of St. Gall, at the age of thirteen. There he gained many friends by his exuberant spirits, combined with good nature, whilst at the same time he made an excellent record as a scholar. His father next sent him to Innsbruck, where he attended the lectures of the distinguished Jesuit professors of the university for four years. At the close of his studies he made a somewhat lengthy visit to the Eternal City, by way of preparing himself for ordination. On his return to St. Gall, Bishop Greith conferred holy orders on him (on July 31, 1871), and now the young missionary was ready to sail for America, where he had determined to work for God and the Church. Arriving here early in September, 1871, he was almost immediately appointed to the professorship of dogmatic theology at Seton Hall, the seminary of the diocese of Newark. This position he has filled for the past eighteen years, to the entire satisfaction of his superiors, as well as of the students to whom he lectured. His accomplishments as a theologian and as a Latinist led to his appointment as one of the secretaries of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, by no means a merely honorary position. No doubt the proofs of learning and ability given by him in handling the delicate work there entrusted to him had much to do with his promotion to the important office now confided to him.

To fill the chair of moral theology, one of the most important in the course, Bishop Keane has been fortunate enough to secure Dr. Bouquillon, until lately the professor of morals in the University of Lille. Dr. Bouquillon's merits as a moralist are well known, not only in his native country,—Belgium,—but also in France and Germany. He is the author of a manual of moral theology—"Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis"—which has been favorably received by European theologians, and is in itself a proof of his deep and sound scholarship. Besides this, his most important work, he has made minor contributions to theological literature. Prof. Bouquillon was born at Bruges, in Belgium, about forty-two years ago, and received his education in his native country. Naturally fond of learning, and gifted with a bright, quick mind, he prepared himself for the professor's chair by careful, conscientious, and intelligent toil at the University of Louvain, and his scholar-

ship there was so marked and so well appreciated that he was appointed to a professor's chair in Belgium immediately after his ordination. His reputation as a scholar and teacher, however, soon passed beyond the limits of his own country; hence his appointment at Lille, one of the most successful of the Catholic high schools founded by the enthusiasm and self-sacrifice of the Catholics of France, when infidelity had shamefully usurped the schools founded by their ancestors in the ages of faith.

The trustees of the University have also secured the services of Fathers Hewit and Searle, of the Congregation of St. Paul. The former will lecture on Church history, the latter on astronomy and physics. There are few priests in the Union better known than the superior of the Paulists, Father Augustine Francis Hewit. He was born at Fairfield, Conn., in 1820, being the son of a Congregationalist minister. Having graduated at Amherst at the age of nineteen, he took up the study of law. But young Hewit's mind naturally had a strongly religious and metaphysical bent, and the law did not satisfy the cravings of his heart. So, like his father, he abandoned jurisprudence and studied divinity. He was licensed to preach as a Congregationalist minister in 1842, but he was evidently out of sympathy with the stern fatalism of the Calvinistic creeds. Consequently he abandoned Congregationalism and was ordained deacon in the Episcopal church. Nor did he find rest there. Enthusiastic and fervent, he dedicated himself to the work of the foreign missions, and was about to accompany Bishop Southgate as a missionary to Turkey. But God had determined otherwise. The Missionary Committee disapproved of his appointment, for the young clergyman, they discovered, to their horror, held views distinctively Roman Catholic. Some time afterwards (1846) he was received into the Catholic Church, and the following year Bishop Reynolds, of Charleston, raised him to the priesthood. At Charleston his learning and gifts as an educator led to his selection as vice-principal of the Charleston Collegiate Institute. The work was congenial, and yet he felt that further sacrifices were required of him, and in 1850, bidding adieu to the world, he became a Redemptorist. When eight years later F. Hecker, encouraged by Pius IX., founded the Congregation of St. Paul, destined in a special way to make the Church known among Americans, F. Hewit felt the call to share in this undertaking and became one of the first and most active members of the new Congregation. Alongside of his chief he worked as preacher, missionary, author, professor, shrinking from no toil and ready for every call of duty. He is an untiring student, interested in every branch of philosophical and theological literature, equally familiar with the early Church Fathers and the most modern theological authorities. F. Hewit

has been a voluminous and successful writer. He began his career as an author by publishing his "Reasons for Submitting to the Catholic Church" (1846), since which time he has published, besides other controversial works, "Problems of the Age, with Studies in St. Augustine on Kindred Subjects" (1868); he also wrote lives of the Princess Borghese, of F. Dumoulin-Borie, and of Father Baker. He did a noble service to American Catholic literature by editing Bishop England's works. In fact, his pen has seldom rested, and countless are his contributions to recent periodical publications.

As we have already stated, besides Father Hewit, the Paulists will furnish another distinguished member of the faculty of the new University, the Reverend George M. Searle. Father Searle will lecture on astronomy and other branches of science. He is well equipped for the task he has undertaken. A profound mathematician, a skilful physicist and a distinguished astronomer, he is a living proof that true science is not in hopeless opposition to Catholic faith and teaching. Born in London in the year 1839, he was a graduate at Harvard in 1857, and at once chose astronomy as his life pursuit. Immediately after graduation we find him at work as an assistant at the Dudley Observatory in Albany. There the young astronomer, barely a year from college, signalized himself by discovering the asteroid Pandora, September 11th, 1858. Leaving Albany in 1859, he entered the United States Coast Survey Service, doing yeoman's work under Professors Bache and Peirce. His merits soon received acknowledgment in the shape of a call to an assistant professorship in the Annapolis Naval Academy, where he taught from 1862 to 1866. It was in 1862 that Father Searle, after deep and careful study, took the decisive step of his life, and became a Catholic. Meantime Harvard had not lost sight of her brilliant alumnus. In June, 1866, he was honored by his *alma mater's* summons to take his place as an assistant in the Harvard Observatory. There he pursued his favorite astronomical studies until March, 1868. But science alone no longer satisfied his heart and mind; he felt that there were nobler ends to work for; that he was called to work for God and His Church. He gave up all his brilliant prospects without a pang, bade farewell to his *alma mater* and the world, and donned the plain cassock of the Paulist Fathers (1868). Entering heart and soul on his new studies, he was soon raised to the priesthood (1871). Henceforth he labored with characteristic vigor in the pulpit and the church, but he did not give up his old love. He became the science professor in the Paulist seminary, and continued his scientific experiments in its laboratory. Soon he was enabled to advance the art of photography by his studies, and is carrying on original researches in va-

rious directions. In 1877 he published a volume on the "Elements of Geometry," in which, according to the high authority of the Jesuit Father Charbonelle in the *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, he has succeeded in giving satisfactory demonstrations of some fundamental propositions that had been accepted without rigid proof from Euclid's day to our own time. Father Searle's past achievements in astronomy and science are manifest proof that in him the trustees of the University have chosen a most competent lecturer on these important subjects.

On reviewing the faculty of the new University, it needs no seer's eye to discern at least some of the views that guided its trustees in making their selection. The gentlemen they have appointed are none of them novices, none of them young men, with brilliant student reputations only. The heads of the university have looked for ripe minds, minds broadened and deepened by age and experience, minds tested by the best of tests—practical work. On the other hand they have avoided men whose future is in the past; men, if you like, with great reputations, but without the strength, the vigor, the enthusiasm that promises great things in times to come; men out of touch with living scholarship and the present day. In the third place, they have not been satisfied to seek scholars who are specialists in their several lines; they have chosen men who have actually taught, given practical proof that they can make known to others what they know themselves, have the gift of suggesting, encouraging, stimulating, infusing not only learning, but the love of it. Fourthly, the trustees have aimed to secure scholars alive to the needs of the present, familiar with modern thought, Catholic and non-Catholic, in sympathy with the spirit of the age, whilst chivalrously loyal to the Mother Church. Lastly, they have paid due regard to the local needs of the new seat of learning; they have not forgotten that our University is intended for American students, that it is to be the *American* Catholic University. And here a remark suggests itself. Gratifying to all American Catholics is the history of the foundation of their first university; gratifying in its origin, gratifying in its progress, gratifying in its rapid success, gratifying in the sympathy it has met with amongst their brethren in the faith beyond the ocean, and not least gratifying in the friendly interest displayed by their non-Catholic fellow-countrymen. Lately, however, an odd, discordant voice has been heard; a cavilling, fault-finding voice. The papophobists are not all dead, and though they struggle hard to repress or disguise their bitterness, masquerading as champions of liberty, they will break out now and then. Their antics would be comical if they did not inspire pity. Well, some of these masquerading papophobists have made a discovery. Our

country, its liberties are in danger. Several of the professors of the Catholic University will be foreigners. The Pope did not trust American scholars; he insisted upon putting in foreign tools of his own. It is wonderful how well-informed these gentlemen are. They know what the king whispered to the queen, as old Plautus says, and the Pope, whenever he is concocting some particularly vile and secret scheme to enslave an empire or a republic with sixty millions of inhabitants, instantly sends for them to help him keep his secret. Now, without pretending to be in the confidence of either Pope or trustees, but knowing something of what the papophobists are unconsciously and blissfully ignorant of, to wit, the condition of the Church in America and Europe, we venture to assert that the only aim the trustees and the Holy Father had at heart was to secure as professors the best men available. That every chair should be filled by an American was not to be expected by any one who knew, as all might know, that not only superior scholars, but men experienced as teachers, men familiar with the latest developments of their several specialties, would be selected. Owing to the needs of the Church in the United States the best native talent has been forced into the practical work of the ministry, and in the past our diocesan seminaries have been obliged to draw no small proportion of their staffs from European sources. Then some of our strongest scholars and best teachers are liable to be called away from the seminary chair and raised to the bishop's throne. Witness Archbishops Kenrick, Spalding, Corrigan, and Heiss. In fact, Rector Keane of the University is taken from the ranks of the Episcopate. Nor is it at all unusual for non-Catholic institutions of learning to summon European scholars to fill their chairs. Harvard owed much of its rapid progress, some thirty years ago, to a Swiss, Prof. Louis Agassiz. Nobody ever called her to account for appointing a foreigner to a professorship. Look at the Johns Hopkins University. A few years ago the names of Sylvester, perhaps the foremost English mathematician; of Martin, a distinguished English physiologist; and of Haupt, the German Assyriologist, added lustre to her faculty, and there may be other foreigners whose names have escaped us. Princeton is an old Presbyterian university, one of the oldest in the country. No one doubts her loyalty and her patriotism. Still, scarcely a year has elapsed since its presidency was held by a Scot, imported especially to fill the place. We refer to the learned and venerable Dr. McCosh. In New York city, only a few years ago, an Irish divine, the Rev. Dr. John Hall, was made the chancellor of the New York University—like Princeton, a Presbyterian institution. The men who now fret and fume because some chairs in the Catholic University are to be filled by German and French

scholars, applauded when other universities called British and German scholars to their lecture-rooms. But what is perhaps a little amusing, some of the very journals that fret and fume because foreigners are going to teach in the Washington University, have been owned and are edited by foreigners—by self-imported foreigners. Some of them did not even condescend to be naturalized, and one of the former editors of one of these fault-finding journals is to-day a member of the British Parliament. Yet journalists claim, and claim truly, that they too are teachers—teachers of wide and profound influence. But some people's effrontery challenges our wonder—we had almost said admiration. Their effrontery is only exceeded by their ignorance; for these same people talk twaddle, implying that an American Catholic professor of dogma or morals would teach different doctrine from a German or a Frenchman. Let these victims of papophobia make themselves easy; let them wait until the lectures begin; let them follow a course or two; and then, if these German or French scholars teach treason, or anarchy, or despotism, let them denounce unsparingly the professors and the University. Meanwhile, we shall console them by pointing out that revolutionists and agitators are rarely found among hard-working, devoted scholars, among the Newtons, the Cuviers, the Mommsens, the Pasteurs, the Curtiuses, the Hefeles, the Hergenroethers. Such men are neither agitators nor even politicians, as some journalists and some other people are. Moreover, the present state of things is not intended to last. Both the Holy Father, the chancellor, and the rector of the University, as well as its trustees, are anxious to see all the chairs filled by American scholars as soon as this is feasible. Already some younger men, like Dr. Pace, of Florida, and Dr. Shanley, of Connecticut, have received assistant professorships in the departments of philosophy and canon law; and when their success and experience warrants it, they will undoubtedly receive promotion. Meanwhile, Catholics need neither blush for the scholarship nor the Americanism of the faculty as it stands; and before many years we feel convinced that even those of its present critics who are not playing a part, will be ashamed of their short-sighted narrowness.

GIORDANO BRUNO.

THANKS to Signor Domenico Berti, ex-minister of public instruction in the new Piedmontese kingdom of Italy, and to the patronage of the government, those who will can readily form a little library of pretended biographies of Giordano Bruno, and of books and pamphlets setting forth the apostate friar's extraordinary greatness of soul, love of truth,—more especially of philosophic and scientific truth,—literary power, whether as a poet or prose writer, and “way-breaking” originality. Imagine a being fashioned out of the fine and less fine clays from which a Dante, a Campanella, a Machiavelli, a Gioberti, and Mazzini were moulded, and you see *Il Nolano* of the books—a queer mixture, indeed. To this noble man the professional free-thinkers set up a statue at Rome, on last Pentecost, as a sign and a symbol that a new day had opened on the world, a day of grace, giving promise of the conversion of mankind to the “philosophy of nature, which is not merely a doctrine, but, indeed, a destiny.”¹

Readers who are anxious to believe everything that is not of faith, may, by straining a point, form a fairly high opinion of Bruno with the kindly aid of Signor Berti, who, in his latest version of the life of the new great man,² has blended imagination with facts and probabilities in a charmingly unscientific manner. Signor Berti's book is marked by an agreeable style, a careful attention to details regardless of their actual importance, a winning pretence of fairness, and an unguarded use of “perhaps” and “we may assume,” just where a perhaps or an assumption helps to suggest an ideal that does not harmonize with the reality. However, Signor Berti has printed his “sources.” They are at our disposal. Using them without any “perhaps,” and without details that serve only to distract or confuse, we shall be able to form an unprejudiced judgment on the life and works of Giordano Bruno, doing no injustice to him or to ourselves.

Complete justice we cannot do Bruno, because the necessary documents are wanting. The men of his day, including the crowd of free-thinkers, did not consider him worthy of notice. Our free-thinkers tell us that he shook the world; but, if he did, the men of the 16th century were too unscientific to recognize the fact, and too blind to perceive that there was an earthquaker among them.

¹ *Parole per l'Inaugurazione*—Giovanni Bovio. Roma, 1889, p. 30.

² *Giordano Bruno da Nolano, Sua Vita e Sua Dottrina. Nuova edizione.* Torino, 1889.

To the legal system of the time our modern disciples of "the philosophy of nature" are largely indebted for such knowledge as they have of their model's adventurous career. During the course of his trial before the tribunal of the Inquisition at Venice, Giordano told his story, more or less completely, more or less truthfully. The official report of this trial was first published by Signor Berti. Father Luigi Previti, the learned Jesuit, has also gone over these documents and they may be found in his valuable book,¹ as well as in Berti's. We have very little material from which to check Giordano's story. There is the testimony of the five witnesses who were examined during the Venetian trial, and a letter of Caspar Schioppius to his friend, Conrad Rittershausen, professing to give a sketch of Bruno's life and doctrines, and an account of his execution. Besides these, we have some short, though valuable, records, discovered at Geneva by M. Dufour, an entry found at Marburg by Wagner and re-edited by Eugenio Ferrai, and some disconnected extracts from the records of the trial before the Inquisition at Rome. As for dates, only a few are definitely established; and yet these few permit us to follow the wanderings of the *Nolan* so closely as to assure that we are not far out of the way. Giordano's printed books contain some details about his doings, and are unimpeachable testimony as to his teachings, philosophic, scientific, and theological. With these various documents before us, let us see what manner of man was this *egregio* Bruno.

Born at Nola, not far from Naples, in the year 1548, of Giovanni Giordano, a soldier, and Fraulissa Savolina, our hero, Filippo Bruno, went to school in good time,—to a *public* school, of course,—and when he had progressed far enough, being then about eleven years of age, was sent up to Naples to study the humanities, logic, and dialectics. Besides attending the *public* lectures of Vincenzo Collo, *Il Sarnese*, Filippo studied logic privately with Fra Teofilo da Vairano, an Augustinian. At the age of fifteen Bruno entered the Dominican order, and, according to custom, changed his baptismal name, assuming instead that of Giordano. After a year's probation he was solemnly professed; in 1569 he was made a sub-deacon, and in 1572, being in his twenty-fourth year, he was ordained a priest.

Among the three hundred churches of which Naples is still proud, there is none more attractive to the Christian philosopher than the Church of San Domenico, with the neighboring convent, in the *Via Sta. Trinità*, just off the Toledo. There, three hundred years before Giordano's ordination, the great St. Thomas himself taught philosophy to crowds of studious men. There studious

¹ *Giordano Bruno e Suoi Tempi*; P. Luigi Previti, S. J. Prato, 1887.

men of our day seek the cell in which he prayed, contemplated, reflected, and the hall wherein he publicly philosophized concerning nature and the things above nature. According to the customs of the Dominican order, Giordano should have remained in the famous convent where he passed his nine years of preparation for the priesthood. Strange to say, immediately after ordination he was sent to Campagna, and there he celebrated his first Mass. Soon he was shifted to another house, and then to another. Having had a rambler's experience in the province, he was at length brought back to Naples in 1576. Why did his superiors think that Giordano's constitution required such frequent changes of air? According to his own story, he began to doubt about the truth of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity when he was eighteen years of age. He had maintained certain un-Christian views of his own. Then the friars misunderstood him once, when he gave away some sacred pictures that he had, retaining only a crucifix. The friars thought he meant to show a contempt for holy things. Once he suggested to a novice, who was reading an ascetic work on the seven joys of Mary, to throw away the book and busy himself with the lives of the Fathers. Charges were twice made against him.¹ The first batch was dismissed. The second accusation was more serious. There were articles other than those I have mentioned, said Bruno to the Venetian Inquisitors. "I do not know what they were."² Here Signor Berti forgot the "perhaps." Whatever the charges were, Giordano knew enough about them to deem them serious, for he slipped out of San Domenico and made his way to Rome. In the holy city he found a refuge in the convent of *Santa Maria sopra Minerva*, the residence of the general of the Dominicans. Letters from Naples advised him that the papers in his case had been forwarded to Rome. A second time we are assured, by Giordano's actions, that he knew what were the charges against him, and that he had a full measure of their seriousness. Without asking leave, he hurried away from the *Minerva*, put off his friar's dress, and took to the road. When next we hear of him he is at Genoa. Remaining there only a few days, Bruno wandered to Noli, some twenty-five miles away, on the Riviera. At Noli, which was then a wealthy and important town, he taught grammar to children, and gave private lessons on the Sphere—quite a fashionable study at this time. After four or five months in Noli, Bruno thought to try his fortune at Savona. A fortnight there disenchanted him. Turin housed him next. He was not satisfied with the metropolis of Piedmont, and speedily passed

¹ See *Report of Venetian Trial*—Berti, pp. 392, 401, 402, 403.

² Berti, *loc. cit.*, p. 420.

out of its gates on the way to Venice. Though they had the plague in Venice, Bruno stayed there two months, going thence to Padua. During the three days he remained in Padua he fell in with some Dominicans, who, according to his story,—and a likely story it is,—recommended him to wear his habit, even if he had no intention of continuing as a member of the order. On reaching Bergamo, he acted just as if he had been advised by somebody to do a clever thing. He bought a piece of white cloth, had a new robe made, put on a hood that, by good luck, he carried away from Rome, and, thus accoutred, played the friar at Brescia, Milan, Turin, and Chambéry. Occasionally he lodged with the Dominicans, and, curiously enough, was rather coldly received. At length, in the early part of the year 1579, he halted at the "Rome of Calvin"—Geneva. A number of Italian "philosophers," known as Anti-Trinitarians, had a church at Geneva. They sought out the newcomer and asked him to join them. Bruno answered, so he swears, "that he had no intention of professing the Genevan religion, because he did not know what religion it was."¹ They insisted that, even if he would not put on their religion, he should wear their clothes; whereupon Bruno cut up his friar's robe and had it fashioned into a garment of the proper Calvinistic style. He now obtained employment as a corrector in a printing office, but, after a couple of months he was told that if he did not become a Calvinist he could not remain in the city. Like a man of spirit, Giordano shouldered his kit, deprived Geneva of his egregious presence, and smiled sweetly on Lyons.

The story of Bruno's Genevan experience, as here narrated, is taken from his sworn testimony before the Venetian Inquisitors. The documents published by Theophile Dufour, director of the Genevan archives, prove that the ex-friar was inclined to be over free with truth, and that the charges made against him at Naples were not the only matters he would willingly hide. From M. Dufour's documents,² which may be found in Berti's book, we learn that under the name and title of Philippus Brunus, *sacrae theologiæ professor*, our great philosopher of nature matriculated at the Academy of Geneva, on May 20th, 1579. In order to be admitted as a student in this academy, founded by Calvin, Philippus, or Giordano, was compelled to accept and sign the confession of faith imposed by the regulations of 1559. Filippo's name is likewise found on a roll of the members of the Italian Anti-Trinitarian church of Geneva. Could we doubt both of these records, our doubts must speedily be removed in face of the following facts, culled from

¹ *Report of Venetian Trial*—Berti, p. 393.

² *Giordano Bruno à Genève*—Berti, *Vita*, pp. 449-459.

the Genevan state papers and from the Acts of the consistory. Shortly after entering the academy, Bruno attacked De la Faye, the professor of philosophy, printing certain answers against his teachings and certain invectives against him. Not satisfied with this truly philosophical action, Giordano defamed the ministers of the church, in speech and writing. On the sixth of August, 1579, he was arrested and tried for this intolerable exhibition of free thought and rude expression. After an explanation and apology he was discharged, on condition that he should ask God's pardon, and also the professor's, and destroy the libels he had printed. Next he was taken before the consistory, on August 13th, where he bandied words, lavished humble apologies, suffered a rebuke, was informed that a man who made trouble in the school, as he did, could not be endured, and finally was forbidden *to receive the sacrament*. On the 27th of the same month, he presented himself before the consistory, acknowledged his fault, and begged that he be reprimanded, and that the interdict against receiving the sacrament be removed. The reprimand was generously accorded him, and the interdict removed. Signor Berti is troubled about this evidence. There can be no doubt, he says, that Bruno was a Calvinist, at Geneva, *exteriorly*; but, *interiorly*, we may be certain he was—something else. Listen to Bruno again, on the occasion of the fourth interrogatory of the Venetian Inquisitors:¹ "I have read books of Melanchthon, Luther, Calvin, and other ultramontane heretics, not, indeed, to learn their doctrines, nor to make use of them, esteeming these men more ignorant than I am, but I have read them through curiosity." "I despise the above-named heretics and their doctrines, because they do not merit the name of theologians, but of pedants, but I esteem, as I ought to, the Catholic doctors, especially St. Thomas, whom I have always esteemed and loved as my very soul." These are the lying words of a pretended Catholic, who had in fact accepted the "heretical doctrines of men he despised," and who worshipped with forms devised by "pedants more ignorant than himself." Perhaps this was monumental lying!

We can now understand why *Il Nolano* was in haste to have done with the Genevans. His five months' stay—and not two months', as he testified—was not wholly agreeable. Had Bruno been seeking a chance to be burned for free-thinking, there was no more inviting spot in Europe. Calvin had "martyred" Gruet and Servetus "without shedding of blood." Valentino da Cosenza escaped Geneva only to find a pyre awaiting him at Berne. Ochino, Simone da Lucca, the two Socini, Alciati, Biandrata, and many other Italian "reformers," were persecuted out of the city. Perhaps

¹ Berti, *loc. cit.*, p. 409.

Bruno valued a conjoined exterior and interior more than did these nobler souls.

With a whole skin, the ex-Calvinist and ex-friar reached Lyons in due time. Though the city enjoyed the honor of entertaining a fair company of Italian free-thinkers, Giordano was not happy. Toulouse gave greater promise, with its university and the ten thousand students who were free of speech and free in act, if not in thought. For a time our philosopher was pleased to give the Toulousans private lessons on the Sphere. His ambition was for greater things, however, and, if we may believe himself, he took a doctor's degree at the university, and then competed for the vacant lectureship of philosophy. He won the prize, and during two years filled the chair of philosophy, with how great success we can only judge from the fact that, some time after leaving Toulouse, he claimed that his enemies there had made trouble for him. Record we have none other than his statement. All we can say is that he did not write his name large in the history of the university.

From Toulouse the doctor journeyed to Paris, where he arrived about the middle of 1581. Madcap Henry III. was king. The religious troubles were at their height. Bruno was not active in public life during 1581 or 1582. He devoted himself to writing, and published several works which he had previously begun or completed. Then, as he says, "in order to make himself known and talked about," he began to lecture publicly on the Thirty Attributes of God; and he followed with an explanation of the wonderful *Ars universalis scientiarum* of Raimondo Lullo, a system by which learned and unlearned were speedily made wise and fitted to comprehend all dark and difficult things. This system included a no less wonderful art of mnemonics. The method of Lullo readily lent itself to charlatanism, and Bruno was a better charlatan than philosopher. With his modifications, the new method was calculated to astonish the crowd. Bruno was talked about. He made the acquaintance of men at court. King Henry heard of the wonderful art of mnemonics, sent for the expounder, and, having assured himself that there was nothing magical about it, condescended to take lessons from the grand philosopher of nature. To his Majesty Bruno dedicated one of his works: "*De Umbris Idearum*." We may trust Berti when he says that, in the "*De Umbris*," "rationalist and pantheist ideas are clearly expressed." Giordano's cleverness, his flattery—as a flatterer he deserves the qualification "egregious"—won the king. The royal professor of mnemonics ventured to ask for an appointment as "extraordinary" professor at the Sorbonne. Our ex-Calvinist was so conscientious, if we are to believe his testimony at Venice, that, though he had the right, on account of his Toulousan honors, to

give ordinary lectures, he was unwilling to do so because, by the rules of the university, these officials were obliged to attend Mass. Giordano "always avoided this, because he knew he was excommunicated on account of leaving his order."¹ What a sweet, simple soul it is, the soul of a philosopher of nature!

The king was princely, and saved Bruno's conscience by appointing him "extraordinary" lecturer. Toward the end of 1583 Bruno left Paris, probably not because his success was greater than it had been at Toulouse. What he taught at Paris we know from the books he printed there. After the "De Umbris," he published the "Canto Circeo," a clumsy thing in which men are characterized as animals. This was not a mere fancy of Bruno. He was a believer in the transmigration of souls, and there is hardly one of his works in which he does not make use of the material which is so obscurely handled and so poorly argued in the "Canto Circeo." The "De Compensiosa Architettura" followed, a revised version of the clap-trap Bruno-Lullian method; *cosa di poco rilievo*, Signor Berti thinks, with a just freedom of thought that Giordano would not have forgiven; for he, who knew how to esteem his own work, pronounced this "a jewel." Besides praising himself, *Il Nolano* had been profusely praising other people—those who could help his ambition. All who did not think with him were fools, bears, swine, and asses—especially asses. His Neapolitan experience had familiarized him with these wilful animals, and he had a stiletto at hand with which to prod them. But Brunus, Bruno, Giordano Nolano was the one great man, the *uno savio*, the man who "occupied himself with nothing that anybody else had done." How well he deserved this self-laudation we may, in part, judge from his next Parisian publication: "Il Candelaio." Better men than this adventurer have been burned for writing less scandalous things than this so-called comedy, and yet it will interest the Society for the Prevention of Crime to know that the Italian free-thinkers are working hard to make Bruno's foul screed "popular." For a few pennies it may be had from the publisher of "classical libraries," and even a Signor Berti, ex-minister of public instruction, must give it a chapter apart, where, with an unpardonable humor, or else with an audacity born of a too close familiarity with his hero, he not merely apologizes for this contemptible piece of gross obscenity, but argues, against every rule of ordinary taste, that it is a work of art. There is a devilish art, but "Il Candelaio" does not rise even to that low level. Without plot, without any truthful presentation of honest or dishonest human nature, without humor, drearily, wearily wordy, the "comedy" is

¹ Venetian Trial—Berti, *Vita*, p. 394.

notable only for its inanity, vulgarity, blasphemy, and filth. Had Signor Berti written "Il Candelaiio," the humor, at least, would not have been wanting, as the following quotation from his eulogy of Bruno will prove: "This (play) is one of those episodes which reveal both the defects and the excellence of his talent, *as well as the disorder of his youthful passions.*"¹ Signor Berti's suggestion is based on his study of the comedy. From internal evidence he is convinced that "Il Candelaiio" is a work of Giordano's twentieth year, and that he carried away the MSS. with him, wholly, or in good part, finished when he fled from Naples. Signor Berti adds no perhaps, nor shall we, but some one less considerate may add, that, perhaps, while at Naples, Giordano knew that if certain charges were not made against him, it was not for want of material. Signor Berti evidences humor, keen perception, and a parliamentary conscience in another sentence, whose import no student of Bruno should, for a moment, lose sight of. "I think," these are Signor Berti's words freely rendered, "I think that I can claim, without exaggeration, that you will find the writer of comedy in all his philosophical works, and, in the comedy, the author of the philosophic works."² We can hear Signor Berti's guffaw.

And now we are with Giordano in London. He is, according to his own story, an inmate of the establishment of Castelnau, the French ambassador. The virtuous King Henry had favored the comic philosopher with letters of introduction. Bruno was simply Castelnau's "*gentiluomo*." Still desirous of having himself talked about, he published a "Spiegazione dei Trenta Sigilli," dedicated to Castelnau. In this work he announces himself as "doctor of an exquisite theology, and professor of a wisdom purer and more innocent than that usually taught." He is also "the awakener of the sleeping, the vanquisher of presumptuous and obstinate ignorance." He is "neither Italian nor Briton, neither male nor female, neither bishop nor prince, neither civilian nor warrior, neither monk nor layman, but citizen and "*domestico*" of the world, son of father sun and mother earth."³ A strange being, indeed! After the "Spiegazione," he printed the "Cena de le Ceneri," the "De la Causa, Principio e Uno," the "De l'Infinito, Universo e Mondi," the "Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante," the "Cabala de Cavallo Pegaseo," and the "Eroici Furori." The philosophic ring of these titles tells of the method and the man. Some people have been impressed with the notion that Bruno was burned because he taught the theory of Copernicus. The first evidence we have that Giordano had any acquaintance with this theory appears in the "Cena de le Ceneri," of 1583. Coper-

¹ Berti, *Vita*, pp. 156-157.² Berti, *Vita*, p. 157.³ Berti, *loc. cit.*, p. 171.

nicus's work, "De Revolutionibus Orbium," had been before the world for close on half a century, so that Giordano was far from being an early disciple of the great canon of Thorn. When a youth in Naples Bruno had every chance to study the new arguments adduced in favor of the old Pythagorean theory. Indeed, the Neapolitans claimed that Copernicus had not advanced the position of their school, arguing that he derived his proofs from existing manuscripts of the Calabrian, Tallavia, who preceded Copernicus by a century; and Bruno himself made a long catalogue of the writers who taught the doctrine of the motion of the earth before the famous Catholic astronomer.¹ The value of Giordano's support of the Copernican theory may be estimated from the following sarcastic judgment of Signor Berti: "The lively and copious images, the warmth, the enthusiasm, with which Bruno discourses of the Copernican system, lead us to believe that he embraced that system rather from an impulse of fancy or of poetic intuition than from any rational process of the mind." The infinity of the universe is Bruno's thesis, one that Copernicus spurned.

In the works mentioned, *Il Nolano* devoted himself to boasting, as usual, and to abuse. He is a "Diogenes, who, if he were in a country that could breed a thousand Alexanders, would be visited by five hundred of them." He *must* praise himself. Could Phidias do other than praise himself? The Nolan is a Columbus, who has found the way by which to mount to heaven, and opened the veil of the clouds, so that men may see beyond. The "Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante," one of the London publications, is highly esteemed by modern Italian free-thinkers. It holds place after Tasso and Alfieri, in the "Biblioteca Classica per il Popolo." There is a tradition that in this work Giordano made a terrible attack on the Papacy. The tradition is not founded on fact. "Lo Spaccio" is just what Berti states it to be, "a proclamation of natural religion and a negation of all positive religions." Voltaire, who knew a heresy when he saw it, put down "Lo Spaccio" as "worse than heretical." The *Bestia* represents the animals placed in the heavens by mythology and astronomy. They are signs of what Bruno calls superstition. Setting paganism above Christianity, teaching a corrupt naturalism in morals, defending socialistic principles, scouting every honest belief and every noble doing of men, Giordano jumbles stilted and vulgar prose and puerile verse in a mess of pantheism, materialism, braggadocio, abuse, blasphemy and foulness. Signor Berti's comedian speaks from every page. And yet Signor Giacinto Stiavelli, the editor of the "popular" edition, declares that this book "is one of the few in our literature

¹ Berti; note, p. 84.

² Berti, *loc. cit.*, 84.

that is inspired by a high conception of truth and justice."¹ Stiavelli's conception of truth and justice, and the aim of the propagandists of the Brunonian doctrines, may be gathered from the following quotation: "A spirit illuminated by truth, he recognized the falsity of every existing religion." The "*Cabala de Cavallo Pegaseo*," and the "*Asino Cillenico*," form only a chapter of the "*Bestia*," and, while repeating all Bruno's fanciful notions, are in the main an ironical, satirical attack on Christianity—"malignant," says Berti. "He lavishes derision on humility of heart and mind, and on those who are guided by the *lantern of faith*."²

Not content with ridiculing all religions, Bruno poured out his venom on the English people, learned and unlearned, and especially on the Oxford professors. They were "ploughmen, asses, swine." Those who read his books protested against his rudeness and his coarse vulgarity. Giordano felt the ground going from under him. He tried to withdraw, to explain away, to palaver; but the man's impertinence, self-sufficiency, insincerity, bad manners, were unpardonable. With a fine show of audacity, he opened a course of lectures at Oxford. The "sleepers" had been awakened, however, and at the end of three months Giordano found it convenient to close the course.

Towards the end of 1585 the *uno savio* is again in Paris, and there he remained until July, 1586. Henry III. still reigned, but we hear no more of kings or courtiers, or of learned society. We have a book published here, a windy laudation of a work by Fabrizio Mordente called "*Compasso e Riga*," and dealing with the measurement of the earth. And a second book is of this time: "*Figuratio Aristotelici Physici Auditus*," probably a summary of his private lessons, says Berti, and though "it must be counted among his metaphysical works," "wanting in order, lucidity, completeness, and written in an ungraceful, colorless style."³

These books made no stir. Bruno could not live without his little "sensation." He announced a public disputation at the university. From his own works he gathered a hundred and twenty propositions turning upon certain arguments of Aristotle. The day was fixed—the feast of Pentecost, 1586. His champion, Jean Hennequin, a pupil, entered the lists. The master was there to give him support. We do not know the outcome of the disputation; but we do know that within a few days the great philosopher—of nature—turned his back upon Paris without waiting to print his theses.

¹ *Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante*, p. 13. Roma, Perino, 1888.

² Preface to above, by G. Stiavelli, p. 3.

³ Berti, *loc. cit.*, p. 190.

⁴ Berti, *Vita*, pp. 205–206.

Does any one doubt that the ex-Calvinist is an unbeliever, a free-thinker, a pantheist, "naturalist," atheist, anything rather than a Christian? If we trust his printed words, there can be no doubt as to his position. Listen now to his sworn statement before the Venetian Inquisitors.¹ "For about sixteen years I never presented myself to a confessor, except on two occasions, once in Toulouse to a Jesuit, and a second time in Paris to another Jesuit, with the intention of confessing, while I was negotiating with Mgr. the Bishop of Bergamo, and with Don Bernardin di Mendoza, to return to my Order, but they told me that they could not absolve me because I was an apostate, and since that time I have abstained from confession and from hearing Mass, intending nevertheless to free myself from these censures at some time and to live in a Christian manner and as a religious, and whenever I sinned I have always asked pardon of God, and I would have freely confessed could I have done so, because I have never doubted in the least about this sacrament, nor about any of the others, holding firmly that impenitent sinners are damned and go to hell." We have a school of psychologic novelists. We commend this interesting, because abnormal, character, to their microscopic study.

In this truly Catholic, penitential state of mind, the "malignant derider of those who are guided by the lantern of faith" entered Mainz, where he staid only twelve days. Thence he pilgrimaged to Marburg. On July 25th, 1586, he entered his name among the students of the university as *Giordanus Nolanus Neapolitanus, Theologiae Doctor Romanensis*. "Romish" theology Bruno would profess and none other. The Jesuits have limed him evidently. Our "Romish" doctor next applied to the rector and faculty for permission to teach publicly. The request was promptly denied for *grave reasons*. Perhaps the faculty had word of the man, perhaps they had read some of his delightful works, perhaps they had been moved by his brutal insults to the Germans.² Whatever the grave reasons were, Giordano was not satisfied. With his usual Nolan amenity he sought out the rector at his home and insolently abused him, claiming that the Brunonian rights had been shamelessly violated. The rector made an entry of the facts on the university books, and the name of *Nolanus Neapolitanus* was scored.³

Meantime, the doctor of theology had gone to Wittemberg, where, on August 20th, 1586, we find his name thus recorded on the university roll: *Jordanus Brunus, Doctor Italus*. Without any public commission, our Italian doctor, who was low in funds,

¹ Berti, *loc. cit.*, *Third Interrogatory*, pp. 407-408.

² See *Lo Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante*, p. 205.

³ See the document in Berti *loc. cit.*, p. 459.

began to lecture on metaphysics, physics, mathematics and the *Organon* of Aristotle. His lectures were well attended. The professors and students of the great Lutheran foundation treated him kindly. He was encouraged to try another venture with the famous art of Lullo. Successful, honored, surrounded by those he now loved—the great Germans, who gave to the world Luther, “the liberator of minds, the new Hercules, worthy of all praise for his war on the ecclesiastical power and the Papacy”—Bruno suddenly withdrew from Wittemberg. Why? It seems that, when the penitent “Romish” doctor came there, August, a Lutheran, was elector of Saxony. On his death, Christian, the new elector, turned against the Lutherans and lifted up the Calvinists. Bruno says that the favor shown by the new ruler to the party “opposed to those who favored him”—Bruno—was the cause of his leaving Wittemberg.¹ Does this mean that the penitent Catholic, the ex-Calvinist, the contemner of Luther and Calvin, the pantheist, the sarcastic enemy of all religion, had become a Lutheran, *exteriorly*, of course? Leo XIII. has well characterized the philosopher as one whose “talent was to feign.”

An old tradition says that, while at Wittemberg, Bruno delivered a panegyric of the devil, and it is probably because they believed this tradition that the philosophers of Genoa carried a banner, surmounted by a figure of the Evil One, at the inauguration of the Bruno monument. Beyond the tradition we have no proof of this very reasonable story. Giordano was not less audacious than the present rector of the University of Bologna, Giosuè Carducci, who addressed a hymn to Satan, or than Rapisardi, the poet of Lucifer. *Uomo da bene*, so Bruno termed the Evil One. Why hesitate to panegyricize “a good man,” even at Wittemberg?

Prague was the next city honored with Giordano's presence. Shortly after his arrival he published two small works under one cover, the “*De Specierum Scrutinio*” and “*De Lampada Combinatoria*,” both *réchauffés* of the Lullian books previously printed at Paris and Wittemberg. “Dry and obscure” is Signor Berti's verdict on them. To Rudolph II. Bruno dedicated a compilation of one hundred and twenty theses against the mathematicians and theologians of his day. In these he claims to be the founder of a new Christianity, rejects all authority in matters of philosophy, except his own authority, declares that it is iniquitous and contrary to the dignity of human liberty to submit oneself to the reason of another, proclaims the duty of philosophers to combat the tyranny of the Fathers, and of whoever would preserve this tyranny. Rudolph was a patron. He took Bruno's measure, giving him three

¹ *Venetian Trial*—Berti, p. 395.

hundred thalers, whereupon the Fathers were left in peace, the mathematicians and theologians of Prague breathed more freely, and Giordano hastened to Helmstädt. On January 13th, 1589, he matriculated at the university in that city. The Duke of Brunswick died in the following May. At his own risk, Bruno composed an oration in honor of the deceased and sent it to the new duke, Heinrich Julius. Eighty *scudi* promptly found their way into the pocket of the rhetorician, and forthwith he left Helmstädt. This paltry honor was not the only one he gathered in the city. Boethius was then pastor and superintendent of the Lutheran church of Helmstädt, and he exercised his authority over the recent combat of the tyranny of the Fathers in a most effective way. He excommunicated him from the Church. There can be no doubt of the fact. Giordano protested against the excommunication and demanded a new trial. His request was refused. Is it any wonder that the would-be founder of a new Christianity forsook Helmstädt and sought refuge in Frankfurt?

Comedian! That is not the word, Signor Berti. An apostate monk, who still firmly believes in all the teachings of the Catholic Church, and is anxious to confess his sins and become once more a friar, a laudator of paganism, a scout of Christianity, an ex-cogitator of the philosophy of nature, a recalcitrant Calvinist and an excommunicated Lutheran! And yet an ex-minister of public instruction pretends that he is pleased with him. A comedian! Can there be a looking-glass in Signor Berti's house?

We have reached the year 1590, and we are with the unfortunate ex-Lutheran at Frankfurt. He has made an arrangement with a publisher, who is to print several books for him, supporting him meanwhile in a Carmelite house. There Bruno meets a Venetian bookseller, who buys a few copies of his works for the home market. The Frankfurt publications: "De Imaginum, Signorum et Idearum Compositione," "De Triplice Minimo et Mensura," and "De Monade, Numero et Figura," are, according to Berti, cold, obscure, fantastically allegorical, and in part unintelligible. They are, in other words, fully up to Giordano's average. In February, 1591, we miss Bruno suddenly. We may call it a flight, says Berti. The arrangement with the publisher has not been completed. Bruno is at Zurich. Why did he run away from Frankfurt? No one knows. A Venetian, Giovanni Mocenigo, who had read one of his Lullian books, expressed a desire, through the before-mentioned Venetian bookseller, to take lessons from Bruno; but this had nothing to do with the flight, since the philosopher did not go to Venice and did go to Zurich. Some writers surmise that the Frankfurt town council was about to lay hands on him. For what reason? The subject is as dark as one of Giordano's own

books. He remained at Zurich several months, and then went to Venice and gave lessons to Mocenigo, lodging first in the city, and later on at his patron's house. Mocenigo was thirty-four years of age, a scion of one of the noblest Venetian families, and proud of his wife and children. The ex-friar found a comfortable home in the patrician's house. From time to time he went to Padua to give private lessons to some of the pupils at the university, and to study judicial astrology. Mocenigo, who knew nothing of Giordano's early history, soon learned not only who he was, but what he was—a very bad man, a heretic, a blasphemer, and a teacher of immorality. At the end of seven or eight months, Mocenigo felt himself bound in conscience to denounce Giordano before the Inquisition. The Venetians did not take kindly to heretics. In 1564 the Council of Ten, deeming "that nothing more pleasing to Jesus Christ and to all the faithful could be done than to remove those bad men who followed particular opinions in matters of religion," ordered that all such persons should be driven out of the territory of the Republic within fifteen days, and be threatened with imprisonment and grave penalties if they returned.¹ Mocenigo's complaint was therefore duly considered, and, on May 23d, 1592, Bruno was arrested and placed in the hands of the Inquisitors. As constituted by law, these were the Nuncio Apostolic, the Patriarch, the Father Inquisitor and three nobles—*savii dell'eresia*. Without the presence of the *savii* no process was valid. Monsignor Taberna was, at the time, Nuncio. He attended the first meeting, but was absent afterwards on account of the strained political relations between Rome and Venice. Monsignor Lorenzo Priuli was Patriarch, Gabriele da Saluzzo, a Dominican, held the office of Father Inquisitor, and the three *savii* bore great names, Luigi Foscari, Sebastiano Barberigo, and Tomaso Morosini.

The trial began on May 26th with the examination of two booksellers and of Giordano, who, under oath, began the story of his life and an explanation of his theological opinions. The inquiry was continued on May 30th, June 2d, 3d, 4th, and July 30th. Besides the booksellers, a friar with whom he had conversed, and Tomaso Morosini, at whose house he had visited, were examined. A summary of Mocenigo's accusation cannot but serve to put an end to the myth, so current nowadays, that Bruno suffered because he opposed the teachings of Aristotle, and because he favored the Copernican theory. According to Mocenigo, Giordano had on various occasions told him:² "That it is a great blasphemy to maintain, as Catholics do, that the bread is transubstantiated into the flesh; that he (Giordano) is opposed to the Mass; that no re-

¹ See *Previti, loc. cit.*, p. 181.

² Berti, *loc. cit.*, pp. 377-378.

ligion pleases him ; that Christ was a miserable fellow (*un tristo*), and that he did wicked things (*opera triste*) to seduce the people, that he could well have foretold that he would be hung ; that there is no distinction of persons in God ; and that this would be an imperfection in God ; that the world is eternal, and that there are infinite worlds ; that God makes infinite worlds continually, because he says that he wills all that he can ; that Christ performed seeming miracles, and that he was a magician, and so were the Apostles, and that he felt that he could do as much and more than they ; that Christ showed that he died unwillingly, and that he avoided death as much as possible ; that there is no punishment for sins, and that created souls, by the operation of nature, pass from one animal into another, and that as the brute animals are born of corruption, so were men also, after the deluge, when they began again to be born. He stated that he wished to make himself the author of a new sect under the name of the new philosophy ; he has said that the Virgin Mary could not have brought forth, and that our Catholic faith is filled with blasphemies against the majesty of God . . . ; that our opinions are asses' doctrines, that we have no proof that our faith merits in the sight of God ; and that in order that we should live well, it suffices if we do not do to others that which we would not have done to ourselves, and that he laughs at all other sins, and that he wonders how God can bear so many Catholic heresies. He says that he wishes to give attention to the art of divination, and that he desires to make the whole world run after him ; that St. Thomas and the other doctors knew nothing alongside of him, and that he will satisfy all the theologians in the world that they cannot answer him. Furthermore, he had stated that he fled from Rome because he was charged with throwing into the Tiber the man who accused, or whom he supposed had accused, him before the Inquisition."

In a second deposition, Mocenigo testified that Bruno told him he had been a religious, but had only taken first orders. Deposing a third time, Mocenigo stated, among other things : that Bruno said he had great hopes of the King of Navarre, and when the time came he would be a captain, and that he would not always be poor, because he would enjoy the wealth of others ; that to say that God is three and one is to say an impossibility, to speak ignorantly and blasphemously against the majesty of God. At another time he said that he was quite fond of women, and that he had not yet reached the number Solomon had, and that it was a great sin for the Church to make that a sin by which nature was so well served, and that he held it as a most meritorious action.¹

¹ Berti, *loc. cit.*, pp. 382, 383.

Giovanni declared that he finally looked upon the philosopher of nature as an *indemoniato*. Can we wonder at his coming to this very reasonable conclusion?

There is not a charge in the accusation that is unreasonable. Giordano had scattered heresies far and wide, says Berti. And he proves the truth of this statement by gathering the following heretical propositions from the two works published at Frankfurt, the "De Triplice, Minimo et Mensura" and "De Monade, Numero et Figura": "That souls pass from one body into another, from one world into another; that the same soul can inform two bodies; that magic is good and honest; that the Holy Ghost is one with the soul of the world, and this is what Moses meant when he said that the Holy Spirit diffused itself over the waters to fecundate them; that Moses performed miracles by means of magic, in which he was more expert than any of the Egyptians; that Moses himself invented his laws; that the sacred books are merely a romance; that the devil will be saved; that Adam was the father of the Hebrews only; that other men owe their origin to the progenitors that God created before Adam; that Christ is not God, he was a great magician, and that, having deluded men, he was justly hung and not crucified; that the Apostles were wicked men, magicians, and that many of them were also hung."¹ This is only a small fraction of the heresies and blasphemies that may be collected from Bruno's writings.

The record of his examination by the Venetian Inquisitors is most interesting reading. He was left free to tell his story in his own way, to explain all his teachings as seemed good to him, and to answer Mocenigo's evidence, item by item. He was advised to acknowledge his errors, whatever they were, to make his peace with God, and to determine to live a new, religious life. He was impressed with the fact that the duty of the examiners was, first of all, one of Christian charity, and that their desire was to convert him to the truth and not to punish him. In the hands of one of our clever American cross-examiners Bruno would have been sadly confused. He was a smooth-tongued, dodging, contradictory witness, and certainly a most untruthful one. Again and again did he deny that he had ever taught certain doctrines which he boldly sets forth in his works. He has one distinction, with which a reader can see that he is always saving himself. *Philosophically* he may be a heretic. He is a philosopher and professes to know little about theology. Should he be philosophically a heretic, he wishes it understood that he none the less accepts, with his whole heart and soul, all the doctrines of the Church.

¹ Berti, *loc. cit.*, pp. 297, 298.

With all this pettifogging he acknowledges that he knows that the plea of philosophical heresy, as distinguished from theological heresy, does not save a man from being a heretic. "There are," said he, at the end of the second interrogatory, "several works composed by me, and which I printed, that I do not approve, because I discoursed in them too philosophically, too shamefully, and not too like a good Christian."¹ And at the fourth and last interrogatory he not only acknowledged his errors, after a fashion, but expressed repentance and pleaded for pardon. "It may be," he said, "that, in this long course of time, I have erred in other ways, and have deviated from the Holy Church in other manners than those I have set forth, but though I have thought much about the matter, I do not recall them. I have confessed and I now confess my errors freely, and I am here in the hands of your illustrious Lordships to receive a remedy for my salvation; of my sorrow for my misdeeds I cannot say how great it is, nor sufficiently express my mind, as I would wish." Then, kneeling, he said: "I humbly beg the pardon of the Lord God, and of your illustrious Lordships, for all the errors I have committed, and I am here ready to do what your prudence may determine, and what you may judge expedient for my soul." After making a plea that, in meting out punishment to him, they will remember his cloth, he adds: "And, if life be spared me, I promise to make a notable reform in my life, which will recompense for the scandal I have given with as much edification."

Before the Inquisitors had pronounced judgment, letters came from Rome demanding the extradition of Bruno on the ground that serious charges lay against him there, which he had avoided by flight. The Venetians were slow to grant this request, as they deemed it against their dignity to let a prisoner go out of their hands until the law had its full course. Finally, the procurator was consulted, and on his advice Giordano was handed over to the officers of the Roman Inquisition.

About the middle of January, 1593, Bruno reached Rome. We cannot follow the course of the Roman trial for lack of documents. The few extracts printed by Signor Berti, though not official, are probably authentic. From these we learn that on January 20th, 1600, the Inquisitors ordered that Giordano be handed over to the civil authorities as an apostate who "refused to acknowledge or to abjure the heretical propositions set forth in his writings, asserting that he had never maintained heretical propositions."² Probably he was burned, as Schioppus reports, though we have no legal proof of the fact. It is more than likely that the official docu-

¹ Berti, *loc. cit.*, p. 396.

² Berti, *loc. cit.*, p. 428.

³ Berti, *loc. cit.*, p. 447.

ments will soon be given to the public. Only then shall we know the details of the Roman interrogatories and the truth about Bruno's punishment. From the fact that seven years of grace were accorded the "philosopher of nature," it is evident that the Roman Inquisitors, a most learned, able, and pious body of men, were as patient as ever, and that they used their best efforts to save this misguided man from the legal penalty attached to his crimes.

Modern free-thinkers, who look up to Bruno as a precursor, a prophet, an evangelist, and who pity his fate with oceans of words if not of tears, should know that his punishment was wholly in accord with his own teachings. He had a hearty detestation of those who believe in faith without works, and in the "Spaccio della Bestia" he frankly tells us how he would deal with these worse than heretics if he had his way. "Those who believe the contrary cannot only juridically, conscientiously torment them, but they should esteem it a great sacrifice to the gods and benefit to mankind to persecute them, kill them, and root them out of the land, because they are worse than caterpillars and sterile locusts and harpies."¹ And in the very next paragraph he claims: "That they deserve to be persecuted by heaven and earth, and exterminated as a plague to society; they are no more worthy of mercy than wolves, bears, and serpents, whose destruction is meritorious and worthy work; and so the more of them one removes, so much the more will he merit, inasmuch as these bring a greater plague and a greater ruin than those." After death he would have them transmigrated for hundreds of years, until finally they entered into the bodies of swine or asses. At the fourth Venetian Interrogatory he was less lengthy, but no less positive: "Those who call themselves members of the reformed religion, which is *diformatissima*, ought to be extirpated from the earth like serpents, dragons, and other pernicious animals."² Had Bruno been his own judge, and guided by his own logic, he could not well have avoided treating himself just as the Roman authorities treated him.

Bruno's mental abilities and moral qualities are before us. There can be no question about them. Ambitious, inordinately self-conceited and proud, loose-minded, loose-tongued, loose in morals, unprincipled, strong-willed, gifted with a rare memory, a lively fancy, a furious imagination, and an unending flow of illogical, confused, coarse, indecent language, he placed himself under no restraint other than that which appealed to his cunningly short-sighted wits. Over-measuring himself and under-measuring the world, he failed in his main object in life—to make a name at any

¹ *Lo Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante*. Perino, Roma, 1888, p. 71.

² Berti, *loc. cit.*, p. 410.

cost. Fame he sought through flatteries, sensations, novelties, blasphemies, indecencies, regardless of honesty, consistency, or self-respect. It is the vogue to speak of his "system" of philosophy, though he had no system. His training and natural qualities of mind were eminently unsystematic. He was original in the sense that he adopted an unsystematic form of dealing with philosophical and theological questions. He was no more a "way-breaker" in his handling of the theory of Copernicus than in his discussion of Aristotle. Rehashing the theories of the pagans and Christians who preceded him, Bruno combined, jumbled, theory with theory. The result is not a system, but a pudding. The Germans of the Brunonian school, the school of negation, charge themselves with having found an odd plum in the pudding, and a spoiled plum is the only godsend that is recognized by free-thinking philosophers.

We have followed Giordano as he entered city after city, university after university, religion after religion. He has lectured, written, disputed, flattered, and abused others and extolled himself. Taking him at his own measure, or at the measure which Signori Bovio, Labanca, Stiavelli take of him,—and which Signor Berti, perhaps, does not take of him,—one would think that Giordano stood in the front rank of the famous men of the latter half of the 16th century. Signor Berti has a ready recipe for the making of famous men. When Bruno has temporarily settled himself in a new city, the signor compiles an "*Elite Directory*," naming and picturing all those who have gained a reputation in the political, literary, and philosophical world. These are the men with whom, perhaps, Giordano associated, says Berti, and, consequently, you can see how great a man he was. Now it is a fact that hardly one of the reputable men who really did have relations with Giordano deigned to mention his name. Even Castelnau, in whose house Bruno claims to have resided for months, and who wrote his own "*Mémoires*," has not a word about Giordano. Sidney and Foulke Greville are as silent as if no such man had ever come in their way. The professors and students of the many universities he attended do not know him. His Calvinist and Lutheran brethren were satisfied with an official expression of their opinion of him. His philosophic Italian co-heretics, and there were many of them, never speak of him. Neither Paolo Sarpi, whom he met at Venice, nor Alberigo Gentile, who befriended him at Wittemberg, remember him. Campanella once honored him, in a touchingly considerate way, as *quidam Nolanus*. Is it not remarkable that so great a man was so universally slighted? It is, indeed, difficult to explain. Signor Berti would explain it if he could. He does explain it by

stating the fact in these euphonious words: "*Il nome di Nolano non suonava in quel tempo al modo che suona in questo nostro!*"

Nor did the Nolan name resound as noisily as it does to-day for many a year after 1600. When we do hear it echoing through the vasty hall of time, the sound is not uncertain. The free-thinkers of every nation join in a chorus that is not flattering to the grand Giordano, though it is a beautiful tribute to the common sense of mankind. Mazzuchelli and Cromaziano speak of him contemptuously. He is a "*Ravagliacco in religione*, an illustrious fanatic."¹ "I defy the most acute mind to penetrate his system, and the most patient of men to read it. Everthing is enfolded in dark and mysterious words of which he himself probably did not understand the meaning." So Brücker wrote in the "*Historia Philosophiæ*."² Bailly in the "History of Modern Astronomy" declares that Bruno knew just enough of astronomy to teach the Sphere; and Barbieri, in the "Notices of Neapolitan Mathematicians and Astronomers," puts him down as a "hysteric." Gian-noni, a historian who stands well with the Italians of the new order, dismisses Bruno as a "visionary." "Only love for science and a special affection for our unfortunate *massimo* philosopher can carry one through the tedious text," says Signor Spavento,³ who has himself tediously labored to make a *massimo* Italian philosopher out of a terrible bore. Hegel, who is reputed to have been Giordano's debtor, repaid him cleverly with this acute saying: There was something of the bacchant in Bruno. And here is Gioberti pressing his weighty hand on Giordano and charging that he, with Pompanazzi and Cardano, "universally discredited the speculative sciences." Do we wonder that the men of the 16th century dismissed this sort of a philosopher with silent contempt? And shall we not wonder greatly that men of any age should try to foist themselves into notoriety on his crooked shoulders?

The substance of the fancies, assumptions, futilities, which make up the so-called Nolan philosophy, is not to be misunderstood. "His teaching, even according to his warmest apologists, was merely a blending of materialism and pantheism," to quote His Grace of New York.⁴ "His writings prove him an adept in pantheism and in shameful materialism," says Pope Leo XIII. in the Allocution of June 30th. Every page of Bruno's books witnesses to the truth of these statements. Whether we consult the learned Mr. Bayle or such recent historians and philosophers as Ueberweg and Stöckl, we find a common agreement as to the ex-Calvinist's

¹ Berti, note; p. 349.

² Quoted by Previti, *Giordano Bruno e i suoi tempi*, p. 274.

³ See Previti, *loc. cit.*, p. 284.

⁴ *Pastoral Letter*, 1889, p. 6.

philosophy. "The hypothesis of Bruno," writes Bayle, "is at bottom that of Spinoza, both extravagant pantheists. Between these two atheists the only difference is in the method, Bruno using that of the rhetoricians, Spinoza that of the geometricians. Bruno threw aside precision. He used a figurative language which often covers up the ideas. The hypothesis of both surpasses the sum of all possible extravagances. It is the most monstrous theory imaginable, the most absurd, the most diametrically opposed to all the most evident ideas of our intellect."¹ M. Bayle was at one time looked up to as a very considerable free-thinker. It would, nevertheless, please him, perhaps, to find himself agreeing about Giordano with an American Archbishop and a most enlightened modern Pope.

Was Bruno an original thinker? The adepts in the philosophy of nature assure us that he was so original that he supplied all the great moderns with the germinating seed of their systems. Leibnitz, Hobbes, Schelling, Fichte, Hegel, Lessing, Condorcet, Herder, even Darwin and Moleschott are the philosophic offspring of the great Giordano. It is interesting to read Mr. Bayle's views: "His claim to have set aside the theories of the Peripatetics is absurd. The very contrary can be proven from his books. He owed much to Aristotle and to Plato, everything to one or another ancient philosopher, and nothing, or very little, to himself."² Berti and even Stiavelli concede as much, though the latter is more proud of the fact than is the former.

And yet to this second-hand "excubitor" of worn-out theories, "the most monstrous imaginable, the most absurd, the most diametrically opposed to all the most evident ideas of our intellect," a statue has been raised with rejoicings. As the Pope so recently said, "it is not his noble deeds, his signal services to his country," that made Bruno worthy of this honor. "His talents were to feign, to lie; to be devoted solely to himself, not to bear contradiction, to flatter, to be of a base mind and wicked heart." Was it for these reasons that an international committee glorified him? Implicitly, yes; but explicitly the reason was, because "his one claim to distinction was hatred of Christ our Lord, hatred of the religion which He founded, and of His representative on earth."³ The statue exemplifies, and is intended to exemplify, a politico-religious idea. Minister Crispi is as outspoken as Signor Bovio or Signor Stiavelli. Christianity is to be removed from the face of the earth as cleanly as Bruno would have removed his fellow-Lutherans and Calvinists. The struggle has been going on for fifteen centuries, according to

¹ *Dict. Hist. art Brunus*; quoted by Previti, *loc. cit.*, p. 273.

² Quoted by Previti, *loc. cit.*, p. 278.

³ *Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of New York, 1889*, p. 6.

Signor Crispi. At length the day of victory has dawned. In the place of Christianity we shall have the religion of the philosophy of nature, with no priesthood, no prophets, no temples, and no creed except that of universal free thought.¹ The "dominant hypocrisies" will be put down. All men shall enter into the Church of the universe, whence no man shall be excommunicated. The centre of this Church will be Rome; a Rome without any dogma other than the concordant thought of the nations. Vivified by the philosophy, the ideals, of Bruno, all the people "will at length see what thou seest, O Nolan."² This religion has at the present time a government to aid it, the Italian government. Why does it encourage the religion of nature, of Bruno? Signor Stiavelli knows. It is that "clericalism" may be overthrown, that every chance of a conciliation with the "obscurantist Vatican" may be removed, and that "the war that is being waged against it may be more conscious and more formidable."³ A government of force is to lead mankind to its rational end by means of the "philosophy of nature."

The bitterness, the audacity, the want of conscience of the men who have inaugurated this war, is made apparent by the monument they have raised; a monument which is a sign of shame to the Christian world. Still more, however, is it a sign of the weakness of the enemies of Christianity. The Church of God is not to be overcome by those who fight under the banner of Satan, nor is the Papacy to be crushed by politicians whose model is a scorner of womankind, a teacher of untruth, a scoffer at all law, human and Divine.

¹ *Parole per l'Inaugurazione*—Giovanni Bovio.

² *Parole*, etc., p. 31.

³ Preface to *Lo Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante*, p. 2.

MONSIGNOR CORCORAN.

TWENTY years ago the Church in America could thank God for the possession of three great men, of whom any country in the world might well be proud. They were Brownson, Hecker and Corcoran—our great philosopher, our great missionary, and our living encyclopædia of sacred learning. Now we are lamenting the death of the last of this illustrious trio, and no wonder if we regard the loss as irreparable. Upon one after another of these three tombs have been laid the tributes of reverent admiration and profound sorrow. And to none of the three has the tribute been paid more lovingly and more universally than to Monsignor Corcoran.

The sunny Southland, to which he was ever so loyally attached, laments his loss, and numbers him among her noblest sons. Charleston enshrines his memory undyingly amid that galaxy of wonderful men, grouped around the immortal Bishop England, who have given her so enviable a place in the annals of the Church's first century in this country. Many a grateful heart in the two Carolinas bears testimony to-day to the fatherly gentleness, the untiring patience, the heroic self-sacrifice with which, like the Apostle of the Gentiles, amid sufferings and want and dangers of every kind, he did all his duty as a true priest to the flock of Christ. Many an humble child of God can tell with tearful thanks with what simplicity and assiduity he ministered to both their bodily and their spiritual wants, even when already his great learning had made him noted throughout the world.

Countless priests in every part of the country are lamenting the translation from among us of the great scholar whose name has been for so many years a household word in every home of sacred science throughout the land; who towered so high in his peerless intellectual pre-eminence that it was no disparagement of any one else to call him the most learned man in America, and who, out of the vast store-house of his knowledge, was ever ready with winsome simplicity and fraternal sympathy to give forth in response to every question and every need. It was an unspeakable comfort to have such a treasury ever at hand to draw from at any time, and it is an unutterable sorrow and incalculable loss to have its doors barred to us forever by the angel of death.

To the Bishops of the country he was an invaluable counsellor, a sort of court of last appeal in all matters calling for the clearest and surest learning. Sadly will they miss him in their Plenary

Councils, where his presence was ever expected as a matter of course, where his familiar portly form was as welcome to every eye as the matchless cadences of his Latinity were musical to every ear, where it was a pleasure even to listen to the minutes of a meeting when Dr. Corcoran read them, and where fullest security might be felt as to the perfect finish of the acts and decrees when his hand was to give them their final shape.

Not to the Bishops of our country alone, but to the Bishops of the world does the news of his death come with mournful import. Some of them still live to remember the American student of the Propaganda who, more than forty years ago, bore off the intellectual palm from all the rival students of the world in the Eternal City, and with a modesty which won their affection, while his powers of mind commanded their admiration. And still more will recall the American theologian of the Vatican Council, who, amid that unparalleled assemblage of the world's picked men, was advanced by the sheer force of his marvellous learning to the very forefront of those great minds, and into the narrowest inner circle of the most renowned theologians, on whom rested the responsibility of ultimately formulating the most important matters that were to engage the attention of the Council, and to constitute its immortal decrees.

How glad he was to take refuge from all this publicity and responsibility in the pleasant and congenial home which Providence had prepared for him in the Seminary of St. Charles at Overbrook! And how fondly will the hundreds of students, who have gone through its courses these nearly twenty years past, cherish the memory of the incomparable teacher whose lessons it was their good fortune to receive! Never will they forget "the old Doctor," in form and feature so like to the Angel of the Schools, whom he seemed to them to rival in depth and extent and accuracy of erudition. Highly privileged they were, indeed, to have been the disciples of so wonderfully learned and so every way lovable a master. And great and inconsolable may their sorrow naturally be, that they can hear his words of wisdom and of kindness no more.

But most heavily of all, we may well believe, must his loss be felt by this AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, whose head and guide and animating spirit he had been ever since its inception. No one can have forgotten the characteristic modesty with which he said, in his "Salutatory":

"We are not without misgivings, either as to the arduous nature, or the probable success of our undertaking. We wish that some consciousness of power might enable us to say with the Roman

orator, '*neque illud ipsum, quod est optimum, desperandum est; et in præstantibus rebus magna sunt ea, quæ sunt optimis proxima.*' But, at least, we may say with the Umbrian poet:

'In magnis et voluisse sat est.'"

And no one surely can doubt that the aspiration and the hope have been fully realized. The reputation of his name at once placed the QUARTERLY in the front rank of learned periodical literature; and during the fourteen years of its existence, his matchless ability, joined with his quiet but untiring energy, has kept it in its high place with honor. The articles from his pen would of themselves suffice to make the reputation of any review. Whatever the nature of the subject that he had to treat, it served to show his phenomenal acquaintance with every department of learning, and with nearly everything of value that has ever been written on any topic of importance. What other men would have to seek on the shelves of their libraries, he seemed to have systematically stored up in his ample mind, under the custody of a never-failing memory. He seemed never at a loss for needed information, how recondite soever it might be. And amid the treasures of his erudition his judgment sat, not blindfolded, but clear and keen of sight, with balance and sword like those of Justice herself in their truth and impartiality. Of his articles it could always be said: "No one but Dr. Corcoran could have written this."

His power of expression, too, was as exceptional as the extent of his knowledge was wonderful. Naturally endowed with an exquisite artistic taste, and trained by his years in classic Italy to a just appreciation of faultlessness of form, it seemed natural to him to clothe the noblest thoughts in the noblest and fittest words. The great masters of style in all ages and all tongues were to him like familiar friends, and, in their abiding companionship, the grander the thoughts that possessed his mind, the purer and more majestic naturally grew the diction which sought to give them utterance. The style of Dr. Corcoran, united to such learning as his, was, to use his own beautiful expression, "like the mantle of gold which enwrapped the matchless Olympian Jove of Phidias."

Not a few have wondered that a man of his powers should have limited himself to the field of periodical literature, instead of writing books that would have been worthy monuments of his genius and lasting blessings to mankind. Many a time was he affectionately chided for it. But with a quiet smile he would answer: "The world has more books than it knows what to do with, and it needs no books from me." In fact, the helpful instinct of his priestly office ever found its prompting in the present needs of his genera-

tion. His literary life, besides, received its direction when, soon after his ordination, he was called upon to carry on the work so grandly inaugurated by Bishop England, of answering with ever-ready tongue and pen the honest questions and the dishonest sophisms of the erring and hungry souls around him. The nervous, anxious mind of our age, constantly doubting, constantly questioning, and urging its doubts and its questions in ever-changing shapes, requires that the providential expositors of God's truth should be ever on the alert, quick to meet the turn and the shape of each day's needs. Hence the writings of men like Newman and Manning, men raised up to be great powers in their generation, have scarcely at all been works of closet study, deliberate efforts at book-making, but have been called forth as present answers to urgent questions and instant needs, and embody, as it were, not only great truths, but the history of the generation to which they were uttered. Such, too, was the vocation of Dr. Corcoran; hence his life-work lay mostly in the periodical literature of his day.

When, therefore, Divine Providence was pleased to call our great reviewer, Dr. Brownson, from the literary post which he had so superbly held for a quarter of a century, all eyes turned instinctively to Dr. Corcoran as the one man in America who could take his place. How well he fulfilled the expectations all tongues are now proclaiming.

Hardly indeed could two men be more dissimilar in natural qualities than these two illustrious writers. Their characters were as different as their faces—Brownson's, lion-like in eager aggressiveness and force; Corcoran's, the very embodiment of gentle repose and unruffled calm. But we may believe that the contrast came even less from temperament than from the different tenor of their intellectual lives. Beautifully has Dr. Corcoran himself described the contrast in his obituary of the veteran reviewer, picturing with a master-hand the mental storm and struggle which left their lasting imprint on Brownson's every lineament, and breathed in his manner and his words: "How toilsome and desolate was the road over which he travelled, none can adequately feel but he who has trod the same dreary path, and can judge from his own experience. Those born to the inheritance, and brought up in the household of faith, can form no just conception of it. He that stands safely on the shore watching the struggles of the mariner, who is a prey to the fury of winds and waves, and in imminent danger of being swallowed up, far from enjoying the sight like the heartless worldling of Lucretian philosophy, may pity the sufferer and pray for his rescue; but he never can realize the mental agony

of him who is battling for life against such fearful odds. His own sense of security is a barrier to *sympathy* in the full, original sense of the word, which implies fellowship in suffering. Thus it is with the Catholic who dwells in the house built upon a rock by no human hand, and from under its shelter looks out upon the unhappy crowd, with no guiding star but private judgment, tossed about by every wind of doctrine, and in hourly danger of spiritual shipwreck."

Here we have the secret of Brownson's storminess and of Corcoran's placidity. Born as he was into the inheritance of the fullness of truth, drinking it into his soul as naturally as he breathed the air, and finding in it fullest satisfaction for every need of mind and heart, there could scarcely be expected in him the hungry craving to find it, and then the burning eagerness to make it known to others, which naturally characterized converts like Brownson and Hecker. Their genius, so long and sadly acquainted with intellectual darkness and groping and difficulty and struggle, naturally found its place amid the blinding dust and toilsome strife where so many needed the help and guidance which their experience fitted them to bestow. Corcoran's intellect, on the contrary, was like some vast cathedral, inviting the weary wayfarer to enter its open portals, that his tired brain might find rest in its calm depths, that his harassed soul might taste peace and hope in all its hallowed surroundings, in the consciousness that it is indeed the home of grace and truth.

No wonder that his predilections led him especially to the study of the Holy Scriptures. It was to him a sweet relief to turn from the babbling tongues of men to the deep eternal truth of the Word of God. He knew thoroughly all the writings and all the schools of the philosophers and the theologians; he was well acquainted with the theories and disputations of ancient and of modern times. But he took little pleasure in them, for all that was true and good in them he found in far nobler shape in the Inspired Word. To that same sublimest of studies most of his other wonderful acquirements were directed. Thus, among the many languages which he knew, his favorite was Syriac, because of its supplying the best key to the understanding of the Bible.

Next to his love of the Holy Scriptures was his interest in whatever concerned the life of the Church of Christ. His acquaintance with all the details of ecclesiastical history was simply prodigious. A glance at any of his articles on Church History must astonish one by the erudition shown in text and foot-notes. His article on "The Papal Power and Roman Forgeries" (July, 1877) would alone suffice to stamp him as one of the foremost historical scholars of our age.

And when from these works of God in the order of grace he turned to the works of God in the material creation, as he loved to do, the same profundity of intellect always characterized him. He could not linger among the noisy crowd of scientists wrangling about the external phenomena of nature; he longed to plunge into her inner depths and study the great laws given her by Him who hath ordered all her realms "according to number and weight and measure." He was one of the best mathematicians in America; and when his brain was tired of schools and councils and the ways of men, he loved to refresh it with long excursions into the calm, soundless regions of the pure mathematics.

When with so exquisitely moulded and so marvellously equipped a mind Dr. Corcoran came to the work of a reviewer, it was natural to expect that all his writings, while radiant with superior learning, should be redolent of the calmness of his intellect and the tenderness of his heart. And so they were. But beneath it all there slumbered a leonine strength, which, when occasion demanded, could be terrible in the manifestations of its anger and its power. His great love of truth and justice rendered him unsparing in his scorn for what he considered untruth or injustice. When especially deceit and fraud laid their touch on the Word of God or the Church of Christ, then his honest indignation made him pitiless in exposing and denouncing the wrong. "There is," he wrote, "an inexorable logic of facts, in the presence of which Christian charity loses all her resources, and must yield the contest. She may weep, but she can utter no word of defence. She is stricken dumb by the sentence of her own Divine Master: "*Ex fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos*."'¹ On such occasions he rivalled St. Jerome in power of withering denunciation, for he felt that no mercy should be shown to those who showed no mercy to the souls they were deluding. To such vehemence we can well apply what he wrote of Brownson's fierce earnestness: "It was the storm-wind proclaiming in clear, loud, defiant blast what might have been conveyed in gentler tones . . . None can doubt that he was prompted solely by his strong convictions and zeal for the truth."

But when, from any side of intellectual wanderings and any form of error, he beheld honest souls struggling, no matter how weakly or how hopelessly, for the truth, then the gladness of his charitable heart gushed forth in words like these: "Science has brought them—shall we say to our feet? God forbid that we should indulge in such idle, sinful boast! No! but it has led them, willing captives, to kneel at the feet of truth. And for such result, though

¹ *Protestant Interest in Patristic Literature*, April, 1888.

it come not up to the full measure of our hopes and prayers, we heartily thank God."¹

A character like Dr. Corcoran's is naturally incapable of human respect. In what concerned truth and justice, no considerations of person or position could dim the clearness of his judgment or warp its calm equilibrium. Human experience has abundantly demonstrated how difficult it is to reconcile such clear-sighted and impartial candor with the requirements of prudence and charity. The lives of men like St. Cyprian and St. Jerome showed that even the holiest and noblest souls may sometimes fail in the adjustment. It could hardly, therefore, be expected that in Dr. Corcoran's long and varied career no failures of the kind should have occurred. But who could be angry with a man like him? Or who would not rather have his reproof than the praise of ordinary critics? And who could, for a moment, doubt the honesty of his intentions and the Christian charity of his heart? Or who could think of imputing to him any haughtiness or any want of due regard or of becoming reverence? Of these admirable qualities we might cite many instances, but it will suffice to mention his review of the "Life of Anne Catherine Emmerich" (July, 1885). This article may well be considered a typical specimen of his work. It is a charming unconscious manifestation of his own character, as well as an analysis of that of the blessed ecstasica and her biographers. The historical and theological sides of the biography call forth an admirable display of his almost unbounded erudition, while his treatment of its spiritual side gives a delightful insight into the depth of his own piety, the enlightened simplicity of his faith, and the tenderness of his relish for the sweetness of the Lord. But when he comes to the disparaging statements concerning Pope Pius VII. and Cardinal Consalvi attributed to the holy woman, his whole soul rises up in protest, for here, as a scholar, he sees historical injustice, and, as a Christian, shrinks from an unsaintly lack of reverence for God's anointed ones. "If," he exclaims, "we really believed that Sister Emmerich had uttered such un-Christian language, we should feel disposed to treat her words as the hysterical ravings of a pious, nonsensical woman. But we believe nothing of the kind." With keen theological and literary analysis he distinguishes between the holy woman's thoughts and the coloring given them by her biographers, Brentano and Father Schmoeger. "The poet and the Redemporist," he says, "though most excellent men, like all children of Adam, have their human weakness, and, without detriment to their character and reputation, may be

¹ *The Latest of the Revisions*, July, 1881.

suspected of occasionally allowing their zeal to outrun their judgment; but nothing of the kind can be suspected of a pure, holy soul that communes with the invisible world, and stands face to face, as it were, with angels and saints and Deity itself. In that presence she could never forget the precepts of Christian charity, nor lose sight of God's commandment to Israel: '*principi populi tui ne maledixeris.*'" How admirable the lesson, and how beautifully taught! Would that poor human frailty might always observe it faithfully.

Another of his writings which tells as much of the writer as of his topic, and gives delightful insight into the sanctuary of his inner thoughts and hopes and aspirations, is his article on the Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. concerning the philosophy of St. Thomas (October, 1879). How his heart must have been stirred to unwonted depths by this utterance of the great Pontiff, that he should thus burst forth: "We can only raise our hands in silent wonder, joy, and thanksgiving, as we listen to those words of matchless eloquence which enhance, instead of impairing, the ardor and persuasiveness of reasoning and exhortation in which the Teacher and Father of the faithful pours out his whole soul to his children." Then with the pen of a master he sets forth the relation and agreement between the intellectual attitude of Pius IX. and that of Leo XIII., refuting with unanswerable logic the imputation that there was any conflict between the two. In like manner he shows the perfect accord between the spirit of the Pope and that of the great theological schools of our day, especially that of the illustrious Society of Jesus, whose greatest writers have ever gloried in being disciples of the Angelic Doctor. Then with characteristic lucidity he sketches the history of philosophy, and shows how its confusion of unstable and misleading theories can mainly be traced to departure from the grand philosophical principles and matchless logical method of this prince of the scholastics. Next, in some splendid pages, he dwells upon the poetical genius and literary dignity of St. Thomas, and, in refutation of the charge that he is unintelligible, contrasts his thought and style with that of the great German philosophers, and concludes: "If you are disposed to be candid, you will confess that, compared with them, St. Thomas is like the noonday sun compared with Cimmerian gloom." Finally, glancing at the warfare against Divine truth ever waged by Satan and by human pride of intellect, and which they are likely to maintain until the end of the world, he asks: "But may not some important results, in the interest of revealed religion and human society, be confidently looked for from the weighty and well pondered action of our Holy Father?" And he answers with this

admirable passage, which is a revelation of his own mind, and which we pray may prove prophetic: "We think there is every hope of it; and that the whole body of philosophical doctrines and the style in which they are taught will be, if not entirely regenerated, purified at least in great measure, and elevated from their present unsatisfactory and degraded condition. The Infernal Serpent will lose a great deal of the influence he now wields over the souls of men, since he set himself up and was accepted as their teacher. His reign in the schools of philosophy and pretentious false science will be stripped of its supports and consequently shorn of its present power, and a goodly amount of that deceitful crop of wicked opinions and teachings, with which the fields of literature and philosophy are now wild and rank, will be unsparingly swept away by the hand of time and of reason when she will have regained her true place and just prerogative. And thus will be verified, in part at least, that happy event which the great poet, drawing evidently from something higher and nobler than Pagan sources, predicts as a necessary consequence of that better age, to which our hearts are now looking forward with fond hope and lively expectation :

"Occidet et Serpens, et fallax herba veneni
Occidet."

Here he has not only given us his profoundest conviction and his fondest hope, but has revealed to us the motive and inspiration of his life, and the providential lesson which it was meant to teach our generation. It needs no deep research to recognize that Monsignor Corcoran was so wonderfully endowed by Divine Providence in order that he might bestow on the Church and on humanity that honor and those advantages which only great learning in a noble soul is capable of imparting. Other men might possess, even in greater degree, one or another of the amiable or the useful qualities for which he is rightly praised. But none of these, nor all of them together, could give to the ministry of Divine Truth that special glory conferred by the aureola of superior learning, illumined by the gifts of wisdom, understanding, counsel and knowledge, which form so large a part of the treasures of the Holy Ghost. And none of them, nor all of them together, could so well and nobly serve mankind as does such a beacon-light lifted up to enlighten the dark and dangerous paths of human thought and life. The need of such guidance to our generation is becoming daily greater, as intellectual keenness and activity steadily increase. Amid the new adjustments everywhere working out in human life, new problems and difficulties will constantly be more and more

loudly calling for all the light that broadest learning and deepest philosophic insight, guided by the fulness of Revelation, can shed for their wise and safe solution. Precious and indispensable and worthy of all honor as is the daily toil of the shepherds of the flock, yet in the face of needs and dangers and wiles of sophism such as the next generation is surely to meet in hitherto unparalleled profusion, the intellectual might of a man like Monsignor Corcoran is a power beneath which all are glad to take refuge, is an aid to which all look instinctively, is a treasure and a blessing for which flock and pastors and prelates are all equally grateful. And when such a life is taken away, as it must be at last, by the hand of death, its moral abides with us, to spur on to bravest efforts and noblest results those whom Providence has called to be in his stead the expounders of truth to the millions who need it.

In many a young heart, we trust, that noble ambition is budding to-day. The glorious Pontiff whose words made Monsignor Corcoran's heart leap with such unwonted joy and pour forth such strains of hope and prophecy, is still appealing by word and by example to all whom God has destined to bless mankind. With unerring hand he points out to them the fields of Scripture, of history, and of philosophy, in which the soul of our great scholar loved to revel, and with stirring accents exhorts them to grow perfect in these, if they wish to do worthy work for God and for men. The voice of the immortal Leo will surely not be unheeded, and the example of him whose loss all now deplore will render doubly persuasive the words of the Vicar of Christ. The Divine guidance, which fits the action of the Church and her children to the exigencies of each succeeding age, will not fail to characterize her second century in our country with an intellectual advance which will give her the position and the influence through which alone she can fulfil her evident mission in our country's future. And every hand that toils for the blessed result, will find courage and inspiration in the heroic men who have prepared the way before them.

No one man has been left to take the place of either Brownson or Hecker or Corcoran. But each of them, it may be hoped, has left not only a lasting influence, but a school to emulate his example and to carry on his work. It may be long, indeed, ere our country shall boast of such a philosopher, such a missionary, and such a scholar. But hundreds of willing and eager disciples may do even more and better work than was done in their day by these towering geniuses. And their prayers will help us on.

Scientific Chronicle.

THE WEEMS ELECTRICAL RAILWAY.

DURING the past year experiments have been made at Laurel, a small village on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, about midway between Baltimore and Washington, to test the efficiency of a new system of electric locomotion devised by Mr. David G. Weems, of Baltimore. The trials have been very satisfactory, a speed equivalent to three miles a minute on a level tract having been attained. Such a result, together with the safety with which the trains can be run and the perfect control under which they are at each moment in their journey, show that the system is eminently practical, and have led to the formation of the Electro-Automatic Transit Company of Baltimore. This company has secured patents for its appliances in all parts of the world, and expect soon to begin work on a road that will show the capabilities of the new system. The experiments at Laurel were chiefly directed to the method to be adopted in carrying the mail, parcels, and perishable light freight. A train will consist of the motor, mail, and express cars. The wheels, motors, and other appliances are all enclosed within the walls of the cars. The motor car is pointed in front, the wedge or point being below the longitudinal axis. The mail car is telescoped into the end of the motor car, the first express car into the mail car, and each succeeding car into the one preceding, the last car terminating in a wedge similar to that on the front of the motor. The motor car is pointed to adjust it to the air pressure, which is thus utilized in keeping the car on the track. The object of enclosing all appliances within the walls of the cars and of telescoping the train, is to present an unbroken surface to the air and reduce atmospheric friction to a minimum. The pointing of the rear end of the rear car prevents suction as the train rushes on. The motor car is eighteen feet long and two and one-half feet square. The track is a twenty-four inch gauge, and will be built on the surface of the ground, except in thickly settled districts, where the road will be elevated. The electricity will be generated at a central station and carried to the motor by the rails. These rails are of peculiar construction, so arranged that the same rail carries the outgoing current and returns the same, so that pedestrians and vehicles can cross the track with perfect safety. These central stations will probably be about one hundred miles apart, as one electrical plant is supposed to be able to supply sufficient current fifty miles each way. There will be no attendants on board the train, which will be under the complete control of the station master, who will be informed by electrical signals of the precise position of the train at every point along its journey.

The train can be perfectly controlled from the central station, the operator in charge being able to start, to stop, and to back the train, to increase or decrease the power as ascending or descending grades require.

These points have all been brought out at the experimental station at Laurel. Here the experimental line is a circuit of exactly two miles. On this short route there are twenty-nine changes of grade, one amounting to one hundred and eight feet in a mile. On this track and around a heavy curve a speed of two miles per minute has been attained, which on a level road is equivalent to one hundred and eighty miles an hour. The advantages of such a system and the new fields of usefulness it will undoubtedly open up, cannot at present be fully realized. Mail will be delivered almost with the promptness of the telegraph. A letter sent from New York in the evening will be delivered in Omaha next morning. The business of the Post-Office and of the express companies will be multiplied. Interest will be saved on remittances at long distances, and new activity will be infused into every part of the country by bringing the smaller cities and towns, and the now isolated portions of the country, into closer relations with the active business centres of the nation. The company has secured one hundred and forty-three patents, covering all the important details of the system. Among these patents is one for a passenger road to be run on somewhat the same plan. Experiments in this direction will be made at Garden City, Long Island. It has been stated that during the exhibition of 1892, Mr. Weems expects to run passenger trains from Philadelphia to New York in twenty-five minutes. All this shows the immense strides being made in the application of electricity, especially in our own country.

NATIONAL ELECTRIC LIGHT ASSOCIATION.

The National Electric Light Association held its tenth convention at Niagara Falls on August 6th, 7th, and 8th. There were about two hundred and twenty members present, and many valuable papers were read and thoroughly discussed. President E. R. Weeks, in the opening address to the convention, drew a bright picture of the present condition of electrical industries. He spoke of the steady increase in the arc light business, and of the growing commercial value of the alternating current, due especially to the invention of metres and motors suitable for such a current. These metres are of great value, for the customer feels more confident if he knows that his commodity is being measured. The president pointed out a bright future for electrical industries from the fact that our apparatus was in demand in Europe; our schools, colleges, and large electrical companies were paying more attention to electrical education, and, as a consequence, "with greater efficiency in apparatus, better trained men and more intelligent management, depreciation will be reduced, the conservatism of investors toward electrical

securities will disappear, and capital will seek us." But the greatest activity at present is in the transmission of power. Here the electric motor is working a revolution. But while Mr. Weeks dilated on these points he called attention to the criticism of European engineers on our street and station construction, which he considers just. More improved methods in station construction would do much to harmonize the electrical and insurance interests, which was a subject of discussion during the convention.

The superiority of the incandescent light was commented upon, but owing to the fact that the residual products in the manufacture of gas have such great commercial value, the incandescent light cannot compete with it in matter of price. The statistics presented by the president show well the present status of the interests represented at the convention. During the last six months the number of arc lamps in use in the United States increased from 219,924 to 237,017; the incandescent lamps from 2,504,490 to 2,704,768. The number of street railroads operated by electricity is now 109, comprising 575 miles of track and 936 motor cars. The capital now invested in these enterprises is \$275,000,000.

Mr. A. R. Foote's paper on "The Value of Economic Data to the Electric Industry" was very able, and heartily approved during the discussion, as it touched a vital point, in fact, the very object for which the association was formed. The electric industry is based on the application of the discoveries of science, and its successful carrying on will depend upon reading experience aright. This latter cannot be done unless a careful and systematic record be kept of the cost, maintenance, durability, and efficiency of each piece of electrical or mechanical apparatus. These records should be kept at all central stations, and so collated that each manager could profit by the experience of all the others. Manufacturers who watch carefully over their inventions could often suggest how their special apparatus could be run to greater advantage, and from these data could learn where and how to perfect their inventions. This would all tend to give the user a better article at a lower price, and thus widen the demand for the commodity. It would, moreover, bear fruit in other directions. A higher grade of workmanship would be required on the part of the inventor, engineer, and mechanic, and to produce these more perfect machines a more thorough knowledge of electricity would be demanded. Thus the practice begotten of the theory reacts upon it, demanding further development that present applications may be perfected and new fields of usefulness developed.

Mr. M. D. Law's paper on "The Perfect Arc Central Station" contained much valuable information on the construction and running of a central station. The report by Mr. Alexander on "Harmonizing Electrical and Insurance Interests" insisted on the improvement of the electric services in general, and the better education of workmen that electric stations may not be considered the great risks they have been in the past.

The paper on the "Constitutionality of Execution by Electricity"

was followed by quite a lively discussion, during which the general sentiment of those present was clearly expressed. They claim, and with good reason, that killing by electricity is a cruel and unusual punishment, and therefore violates the constitutions of the different States. Moreover, electricity, to be a killing agent, should be a certain one, and this has not, as yet, been clearly established, as there are numerous cases on record of men who took very powerful electric currents and who recovered, but withstood the current at the expense of intense torture. Electric firms are opposed to it on the ground that if the law goes into effect it will bring odium on their profession and diminish the demand for electricity; for people will not introduce electric wires into their houses, as they might at any moment come in contact with the instrument that deals death to the criminal.

The paper by Mr. William Bracken on "Electric Traction by Storage Batteries," and that on "Dynamo Room Accessories," by M. C. C. Haskins, contained valuable data of interest to all those present. The papers by Mr. G. W. Mansfield and Mr. E. P. Roberts on "Electric Railways" and "The Electric Transmission of Power," are probably the best on these subjects ever presented to any association in this country.

In fact, the whole work of the conference shows the rapid progress making in the application of electricity, and the effect it is bound to have in raising the standard of scientific education.

IMPROVED SYSTEM OF CABLE TELEGRAPHY.

All know that the relays and sounder used on land lines are too coarse to be worked by the delicate electric impulses sent through an ocean cable. Hence messages sent through the Atlantic cable are not read by sound, as are land messages in this country, but by the oscillations of a pencil of light reflected from a sensitive Thomson galvanometer. This galvanometer consists of a small light piece of steel suspended by a very fine silk fibre in the centre of a coil of insulated copper wire. There is a small mirror attached to this piece of steel, which reflects a beam of light to the centre of a scale placed three or four feet from the galvanometer. The operator sending a message to such a receiver uses two keys, one connected to a positive and the other to a negative battery. A current sent by one key causes the piece of steel to rotate in one direction and produces a deflection of the beam of light, say to the right, sending a current by the other key turns the beam of light to the left. Thus, by these alternate deflections, a system of signals is formed corresponding to the familiar dots and dashes of the telegraph service. By this, the most rapid cable system, an average speed of about fifteen words a minute is secured. This low rate is due to an electrical phenomenon that occurs in the cable while the operator is sending his message. The cable, with its core of twisted wires forming a strong conductor, which is encased in a coating of good insulating material,

the whole bound with hempen twine and armor wires to protect it, is familiar to all. It is evident, then, that as the cable contains a metallic core which is separated by an insulator from the outside metallic coating, and from the water, which is a good conductor of electricity, it is practically a Leyden jar. Now, if one coating of a Leyden jar be charged positively, the other will charge negatively by induction. So as soon as an electric current is sent into the cable an opposite current is induced on the outside. The effect of this exterior current is to weaken the current passing through the core, and induce a static charge which, when the cable is put to earth, as is done after each impulse, runs out at both extremities of the cable, prolonging the signal at the receiving station and opposing the entrance of the next electrical impulse at the sending station. Now, if the operator waits for the complete static discharge, cabling becomes unprofitable, and if he sends the next impulse before the static charge has run out, it will be delayed by this counter-current, thus reducing the speed of telegraphing. It is to overcome this difficulty and increase the speed of sending messages with the present receivers, and with the hope of introducing the Morse sounder, so that cable messages may be read by sound, that Mr. P. B. Delany devised and presents his improved system. Here the operator does not use two keys to send the message, but an ordinary Morse sender so that any operator may work a cable. By means of an ingenious mechanical device two electrical impulses of the same sign are never sent into the cable in succession. But when the key is pressed down and an impulse sent through the wire, a contact is automatically made with the opposite pole of a condenser, and when the key is raised a charge enters the cable which neutralizes the static charge induced by the first impulse and clears the way for the next signal. By means of this system, Mr. Delany, experimenting on the cable which connects Duxbury, Mass., and St. Pierre, Island of Miquelon, a distance of eight hundred and seventy-eight miles, found that messages could be received very well by sound at the rate of twenty words per minute. At the rate of twenty-four words per minute the work was not so satisfactory, but this was due to the fact that the telegrapher receiving the message did not understand the adjusting of the relay used on that occasion. Mr. Delany is confident that this line can be worked well at the rate of thirty words per minute. This is a great improvement, for during the last twelve years repeated experiments were made to receive messages by sound over this cable, and three or four words per minute was the highest speed attained. Whether the method of receiving by sound be adopted or not, the system can be employed with the present Thomson reflecting galvanometer or the Thomson recorder, and the efficiency of the cable will be at least doubled.

QUARTZ FIBRES.

The physicist is continually using electrometers, galvanometers, torsion balances, and similar instruments for measuring almost inappreciable

forces. The more accurate these measurements the better the laws of nature are understood, and the greater the advance made in science. The usual way of determining these small forces is by opposing them with known delicate forces so as to produce equilibrium. The torsion of delicate fibres is the known force generally employed, and the way of working may be gathered by a short illustration. I hold in my hand a small magnet, too weak to raise a small fragment of iron which rests upon the table, but still I can determine its strength in a very simple way. Suspending a straw in a horizontal position by means of a delicate fibre, I place the fragment of iron upon the straw. When the straw is at rest, I bring the magnet near it, and the action of the magnet upon the iron will cause the straw to turn through a considerable angle and hold it there against the torsion of the fibre. Knowing the torsion of the fibre, I know, as a consequence, the magnetic force which balances it.

Up to the present the chief torsion fibres experimented with have been spun glass and silk, the latter being universally adopted in the most exact instruments.

Spun glass is about the $\frac{1}{1000}$ th of an inch in diameter, and would be an ideal torsion thread were it not for its want of elasticity. So imperfect is its elasticity that if a small mirror be suspended by a glass fibre and deflected two or three times in the same direction, a beam of light reflected from the mirror will not come back to the original point of rest, and successive deflections vary this point of rest still more, so that it is impossible to tell what the point of rest is, and as a consequence impossible to determine the torsion.

The natural cocoon fibre, about $\frac{1}{2000}$ of an inch in diameter, was therefore the most delicate thread known for small measurements. Although its torsion is much less than that of glass of the same thickness, still it was not constant, and this inconstancy was sufficient to vitiate delicate measurements.

Impressed with the fact that progress in science required a more accurate fibre for these delicate instruments, Mr. C. V. Boys began investigations which have led to an extremely simple process of manufacturing a very perfect torsion-thread.

The apparatus consists of a cross-bow and straw arrow with a needle-point. A fine rod of quartz, which has been drawn out in the oxyhydrogen jet, is attached to the tail of the arrow. The operator holds in his hand a similar rod of quartz. He draws the bow, places the two pieces of quartz against each other endwise, fuses the joining in the oxyhydrogen jet, and, while the quartz is still viscous, releases the bow and the arrow flies off, carrying after it a fine thread of quartz. In this way very long and delicate fibres can be made. Mr. Boys has had one in use the $\frac{1}{1000}$ of an inch in diameter. Dr. Royston Piggott has estimated some fibres made in this way at less than $\frac{1}{1000000}$ of an inch in diameter. Some idea of this extreme tenuity may be gathered from the fact that if a cylinder of quartz one inch long and one inch in diameter were drawn out to this degree of fineness, it would go around the world

658 times. These fibres are not affected by the weather as silk is, and do not show the fatigue of glass. Hence they are peculiarly adapted for use in the delicate measurements which must be made by the physicist.

MINOR NOTES.

From the *Scientific American* for August 17th we learn that there are at present, in the United States, more than 5650 central electric stations, and that the increase of capital invested in electrical industries during 1888 was nearly \$70,000,000. These figures show the part electricity is playing in our everyday life.

EIFFEL TOWER.—The highest structure devoted to scientific investigations is the Eiffel Tower. On the highest gallery, which is less than six feet in diameter, and over nine hundred feet above the ground, Mr. Mascart presides over the meteorological station established there. The station is equipped with a registering thermometer and hygrometer, a psychrometer, and several maximum and minimum thermometers. One set of thermometers and hygrometers are constantly transmitting their readings electrically to the Arts Libéraux building, where they are recorded. Outside the gallery is a recording actinometer and rain-gauge, and sixty feet below is a large registering barometer. An anemometer with aluminium vanes, which moves under the slightest wind current, registers, by means of electrical contacts, the velocity of the wind, which is recorded on the ground-floor. These instruments, with many others, make a complete laboratory, which has been in working order for some time.

In the CHRONICLE of April last we wrote of a new metal, gnomium, which the German chemists, Krüss and Schmidt, found associated with cobalt and nickel. This discovery has not been allowed to pass unchallenged, and papers have appeared which tend to show that this new metal does not exist. Winkler, whose process Krüss and Schmidt were following, has carefully repeated his method with carefully purified chemicals, and, having found no trace of this new metal, calls in question the purity of the materials employed by the discoverers. Moreover, Dr. Fleitmann, using the method of Krüss and Schmidt for separating gnomium from nickel and cobalt, and using commercially pure metals, not only did not find the new element, but failed to obtain a sufficient amount of impurity to justify the assumption of its existence. He is of opinion that the oxide obtained is a complex mixture of the oxides of lead, zinc, arsenic, manganese, molybdenum, aluminium, chromium, etc., which occur as impurities in the metals used. This throws doubt on the existence of gnomium, and necessitates further inquiry.

Book Notices.

WILLIAM GEORGE WARD AND THE OXFORD MOVEMENT. By *Wilfrid Ward*. New York : The Catholic Publication Society Co. London : Macmillan & Co. 1889.

As a biographical sketch the book before us is a model of what such a work should be. It traces the personal history of its subject from early boyhood up to the turning point of his life, describing clearly his peculiar traits of character, his physical, intellectual, and moral characteristics, and the influences by which they were shaped and moulded in the course of their development. It contains, too, interesting accounts of the persons with whom Mr. Ward came into close contact during the fifteen years of his residence at the University of Oxford ; among whom were some of England's brightest and most distinguished scholars and thinkers, such as Newman, Pusey, Stanley, Jowett, Archbishop Tait, Dalgairns, Oakeley, Faber, and others.

Yet though this alone is sufficient to make the work highly interesting and instructive, it constitutes its least claim upon the attention of intelligent and thoughtful readers. It is the only work we know of that in its fulness of details, definiteness of statement, transparent candor, and freedom from personal bias, even approaches in value, as a history of the Oxford Movement, Cardinal Newman's *Apologia*.

Indeed, the work before us may be properly regarded as a worthy supplement to the *Apologia*, furnishing much-needed information about a side of the movement (and a later phase of it) which the *Apologia* touches upon incidentally, lightly, and of which Mr. Ward was the chief representative and acknowledged leader.

The notice of the movement, so far as Cardinal Newman represented it, was chiefly historical. But in a few years there arose alongside of him another school of thought composed of persons who, as he says, were "of a cast of mind uncongenial to his own," and which, while "working towards the same end, swept the original party to the movement aside, and took its place."

Of this latter school of thought William George Ward was the most prominent leader, if not the founder. The motive power of this later school was primarily ethical and severely logical, as that of the older school, of which Newman was the acknowledged head, had been primarily historical. Of the manner and degree in which he personally surrendered himself to the influence of this younger school, Newman gives a full account, but neither he nor any one else, prior to the writer of the work before us, has given any clear or distinct description of the origin and aims of this later school, though it had a marked effect on the progress of the movement and on its relations to more recent religious controversy.

The volume before us supplies this want, and brings into public view one who, though lacking the qualities which gave Newman his immense influence, yet succeeded Newman as its typical representative during its later stages.

Independently, too, of Mr. Ward's position with respect to the movement itself, his influence at Oxford was very great. His style of writing, especially in his early days, is described by himself as "dry, harsh, and repulsive," yet, according to universal testimony, his conversation

was vivacious, entertaining, brilliant, and at times highly dramatic. Then, too, his marked freedom from even the slightest trace of personal vanity and assumption, his frankness, sincerity, outspoken candor and logical consistency won for him the friendship and warm esteem of men of opposite schools of thought, and differing as widely, as respects opinions, positions, and surrounding circumstances, as Pusey, Professor Jowett, Newman, Stanley, Oakeley, Archbishop Tait, Lord Coleridge, Tennyson, and John S. Mill.

Mr. Ward's intellectual movement towards the Catholic Church might seem at first to be tortuous and disconnected, yet in reality it was not so. He was at first attracted by the writings of Bentham and Mill. Their clearness and desire for reform gave them a strong hold upon him. They led him, too, to see the inconsistency of Anglicanism. Then Arnold's ethical earnestness took strong hold of him. But he soon found that Arnoldism halted and stopped short in several respects. It professed to base all its dogmatic beliefs on the principle of free critical inquiry. But this principle, Mr. Ward soon saw, would lead to skepticism if consistently carried out. Again, Arnoldism strove to keep the supernatural at a distance. It tolerated the mysteries which do not, as it were, force themselves on practical life, but it spurned those which challenge constant and immediate attention—the protecting office of angels, the mysterious gifts of the priesthood, the divine grace of the sacraments. Then, after this, the ideas of Hurrell Froude, Keble and Newman attracted his attention. The deep religious earnestness and evident sincerity of Newman took strong hold upon him; the rejection by Newman and still bolder rejection by Froude of the old lifeless conservatism started his thoughts in a new direction. His sense of the utter delusiveness of the principle of "private judgment" led him to the conviction that the true sense of Scripture is handed down in the Church, from age to age, by tradition. Other kindred ideas led him still further onward, and, in 1838, Mr. Ward openly avowed his adherence to the party of which Newman was the representative. About the same time a number of other very able men joined the party. Most prominent among these were Oakeley, Faber, Dalgairns, Brande, Morris and Seager. Cardinal Manning speaks of this accession and of its relation to the movement as follows: "A new school of thought was rising, as is usual in doctrinal inquiries, and was sweeping the original party of the movement aside and was taking its place." It consisted of "eager, acute, resolute minds," who had heard much of Rome, had cut into the original movement at an angle, and then set about turning it in a new direction.

We cannot follow the author any further in the history of the movement and Mr. Ward's connection with it, but refer our readers to the work itself. They will find it almost invaluable to a clear and full understanding of the Oxford Movement, and its relations to the opposing schools of thought in England, both to those which tended "Rome-wards" and to those which find their logical outcome in rationalism and skepticism. It contains, too, numerous graphic descriptions of the intellectual and moral characteristics of some of England's greatest scholars and thinkers, and of the part they took for or against the movement during the different stages of its progress and at the period of its collapse.

The story of the "condemnation of Mr. Ward" by the Convocation is told with almost dramatic effect. The last chapter of the work consists of a very able discussion of the relation of the Oxford Movement to modern religious thought. Following this chapter are nine

appendices, containing extracts from Mr. Ward's writings and letters, and other documents from Archbishop Tait, Professor Jowett, Dean Stanley, the Dean of Norwich, and others whose ideas were entirely opposed to those of Mr. Ward, but who give their personal recollections of him, and speak of him in terms of high admiration and warm esteem.

Tennyson has written of him the following memorial lines :

FAREWELL, whose living like I shall not find—
Whose faith and work were bells of full accord,—
My friend, thou most unworldly of mankind,
Most generous of Ultramontanes, Ward !
How subtle at tierce and quart of mind with mind !
How loyal in the following of thy Lord !

AUTHORITY; OR, A PLAIN REASON FOR JOINING THE CHURCH OF ROME. By *Luke Rivington, M.A.*, Magdalen College, Oxford. Fifth edition. New York : The Catholic Publication Society Co. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1888.

WHAT ARE THE CATHOLIC CLAIMS. By *Rev. Austin Richardson*, late Professor of the Institut St. Louis, Brussels. With an Introductory Essay, by the *Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A.*, Magdalen College, Oxford, author of "Authority," "Dust," etc. New York : The Catholic Publication Society Co. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1889.

DEPENDENCE; OR, THE INSECURITY OF THE ANGLICAN POSITION. By the *Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A.*, Magdalen College, Oxford, author of "Authority" and "Dust." New York : The Catholic Publication Society Co. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1889.

What is commonly known as the "Tractarian Movement" in the "Established Church of England," fifty years ago, is still bearing its mixed fruits of good and of evil. In one direction it was instrumental in producing the conversion to the true faith of men of such highly gifted intellects and single-minded hearts as Newman, Manning, Ward, Faber, Oakeley, Wilberforce, Dalgairns, Northcote, Lockhart and others.

On the other hand, by bringing plainly into view the logical, historical and doctrinal inconsistencies and self-contradictions of Protestantism, it furnished an occasion, and, to some extent, an actively impelling cause, to others to become pure skeptics and rationalists.

It had a powerful effect, too, and the effect still continues as an operative force, on minds less logical than those of the two other classes we have mentioned, of causing a number of persons to change their mode of thought and action whilst remaining members of the Established Anglican Church, so that from being, as formerly, inactive "high and dry churchmen," they became active in their efforts to imitate Catholic religious services, and to inculcate belief in many distinctive Catholic doctrines, particularly those which refer to the Sacraments. Though, as we believe, they disclaim the name, public opinion has correctly styled them "Ritualists," owing to their closely patterning after the ceremonies prescribed in the ritual of the Catholic Church. But, from time to time, the inconsistency of thus adopting ceremonies (all of which are full of profound spiritual significance), and of believing and inculcating doctrines which have their full and true meaning only in their relation to the Church which authoritatively teaches them, become evident to persons of single minds and sincere hearts among these "High Churchmen" and "Ritualists." Following out faithfully this true suggestion, and corresponding with the grace that is given to them, they find their way, after more or less hesitation and struggling, into the communion of the Holy Catholic Church.

This was the case with the learned and highly gifted writer of the

works before us. He was known in the Anglican sect, of which he was an adherent, as a learned scholar and an earnest Christian. He devoted himself to missionary life in India. While there he became involved in controversy (five years ago) with one of the Catholic bishops in India—Right Rev. Bishop Meurin, S.J. His whole contradiction of the Catholic Bishop's argument was based on a passage from St. Chrysostom's writings as *translated in the "Library of the Fathers"*, edited by the late Dr. Pusey. He afterwards discovered that it was a *mis-translation*. In it an assumed meaning was given to the text which the text itself did not warrant. The assumption was that a certain pronoun referred to a particular person, and *the person's name was substituted for the pronoun, without a word of note or comment. A sentence, too, was also transposed, and this transposition made the substitution plausible.*

This discovery, which Mr. Rivington made with chagrin and horror, led to further investigation of the writings of the early Church Fathers as preserved in the languages in which they originally wrote. The study of those Fathers, and of truths that came into his mind while studying them, brought him to the conviction that Peter was, by Divine appointment, the Primate of the Apostolic College, the visible Head of the Church, and that the Holy Roman Pontiffs are his official successors, and the centre and source of all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction.

Accordingly, Mr. Rivington applied for admission, and was received, into the Catholic Church. His conversion was a severe blow to members of the Anglican Establishment. Nor did he escape the usual lot of converts—that of having his motives and reasons misrepresented and maligned. By way of reply, he published the first mentioned of the books, the titles of which we have given above. Its scope is summed up by himself in the following words:

"If," as St. Jerome says, "one is chosen in the time of the Apostles in order that a head being established occasion of schism may be taken away, how much more now for the same reason must there be a chief in the church? The fold of our Lord is to last till the consummation of the world, visible unity; the unity of external government must remain in it, and nobody has authority to change the administration save our Lord, who established it."

To this work a number of replies were attempted, which evaded the real question and strove to becloud and confuse by irrelevant statements. These Mr. Rivington answered and exposed in a pamphlet entitled "Dust."

Meanwhile one of these attempted replies, which, though evading the real point, embodied much seeming learning, was taken up at Mr. Rivington's request, and refuted by the Rev. Austin Richardson, late professor of the "Institut St. Louis," Brussels. This, with a brief "Introductory Essay" by Mr. Rivington, forms the second of the works at the head of this notice. It sets forth twelve claims which the Church makes. The first is, "That our Divine Lord founded *on earth* a divine society, a kingdom which was to remain *as He founded it*, unto the end of the world." The subsequently stated claims refer to the visibility and unity of this society or kingdom, to the necessity of its having a divinely appointed, visible *human* head; that St. Peter was such a divinely appointed head; that the Roman Pontiff is "the true successor of St. Peter, and the chief or head of the Catholic Church; that *that* unity which all the Fathers pointed out to heretics as the *evident and unanswerable* mark of the true Church, is an *essential and abiding* mark of the Church *in all ages unto the end of time*"; and that this Apostolic and

Patristic unity exists *evidently and clearly to the whole world*, in the one Catholic, Apostolic and Roman communion, and *in her alone*.

These undeniable claims are set forth and proved clearly and briefly and unanswerably in successive chapters. Following these chapters are three very interesting concluding chapters, treating respectively on the "Nature of Schism," on "Anglican Ordinations," and on "Anglican Orthodoxy."

Soon after this, Mr. Rivington, in the third of the volumes we have mentioned above, "carried the war into the enemy's country," by proving by a careful examination of Scripture and of history the incontestability of the Catholic claims, and the utter untenableness of the Anglican contentions and pretensions. The chapters clearing up the existing obscurity and confusion respecting the disputed orthodoxy of Liberius and Honorius, and refuting the charges brought against Pope Alexander VI., are models of concise, lucid statement. The chapters following, respecting "Henry VIII., the Ecclesiastical Politician"; "Elizabeth and Her Clergy," "The Decline of Dogma"—in the Anglican Establishment, "Pusey and Laud," and "The Lincoln Persecution," are also very interesting.

The entire series of volumes is a valuable contribution to existing literature on the subject on which they treat.

THE SWISS CONFEDERATION. By *Sir Francis Ottiwell Adams, K.C.M.G., C.B., and C. D. Cunningham*. With a map. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1889.

We hope it is a sign of good omen that the comparative study of federal government has of late become fashionable with Englishmen. It is not long since we had occasion to notice Professor Bryce's work on the United States; and now the nearest European pattern to our system of government is dealt with and explained in detail by two co-operating writers, one of whom, at least, has had the opportunity of studying his subject on the spot, for Sir F. O. Adams was formerly the English Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Bern, the capital of the Swiss Confederation.

The work opens with a historical sketch that is by no means satisfactory, being too meagre, even in comparison with the other chapters, several of which, though, are far more thorough than the corresponding ones in Professor Bryce's work. True, the story is distinctly divided into seven phases of growth and development, namely: the original league of the three communities in 1291; the confederation of the eight cantons in 1353; that of the thirteen cantons of 1513 (with their dependent territories of Thorgau, Aargau, etc., and their allied republics of Geneva, the Grisons, etc.); the Helvetic Republic of 1798; Bonaparte's Act of Mediation, recognizing nineteen cantons, of 1803; the Federal Pact of 1815; and the Federal Constitution of 1848, with its revision of 1874. But the original relation of the cantons to the German empire is nowhere set forth, nor is it explained how what was at first only a revolt against the Archduke of Austria led to complete severance from that loosely bound confederation of Teutonic feudal lords entitled only by courtesy to the name of empire.

But the exposition of the present Swiss Constitution could not well be clearer. Like our own national framework, it is based on a double sovereignty, federal and cantonal; the union and each of its component parts have separate legislatures, having much the same competence as our own; to the upper branch of the former, known as the Council of

the States, each canton sends two members; to the lower, the National Council, members in proportion to its population. There is a president and a vice-president; but the president is vested with scarcely a shadow of that of the United States—he is practically only a chairman of a committee and serves but a short time, there being four presidents in a legislative term of three years. He is chosen by both branches of the federal assembly voting together. They also choose for him his cabinet, called the Federal Council, consisting of seven members. An important check on legislation is the Referendum, giving to the people the veto power in case fifty thousand voters ask for it. Perhaps it would do no harm to introduce this plan into the United States.

All these matters, and others, are treated in separate chapters, the second dealing with the constitution in general; the third with the federal assembly; the fourth with the federal council; the fifth with the federal tribunals and administration of justice; the sixth with the referendum and initiative; and the eighth with political parties. Other chapters give details of the communes or townships, the cantons and cantonal tribunals, the army, religion, education, agriculture, commerce, socialists and anarchists, capital punishment, international unions, etc. In the last chapter but one is traced an instructive and accurate comparison between the Swiss and United States political institutions, while topics of general reference are taken up in the concluding chapter.

Among these the authors set forth "growing religious toleration," signs of which they see in the probable appointment of a Roman Catholic to a place in the executive council for the first time, in the recent election of Herr Zemp as vice-president of the national council, being the first thus chosen since the adoption of the Constitution of 1848, and in the "curious fact that, in 1887, three Roman Catholics, all from the canton of Luzern, were, at the same time, presidents of the two chambers and the Federal Tribunal." But they fail to censure with proper severity, though they allude to it occasionally, the bitter persecution to which Catholics have been subjected, especially since 1848, and the disabilities from which many Catholics suffer even at the present time. But how can they reconcile with the statement that full religious liberty exists, the fact that certain religious orders are forbidden by law from having habitations in the country, that even individual members of these religious orders cannot enter Swiss territory, that no new religious orders can be established, nor even additional communities of those orders that are tolerated. Messrs. Adams and Cunningham do not explain these points, though they set forth, sometimes with mild censure, individual acts of persecution, like the giving over of the Catholic church of Bern to a mere handful of "Old Catholics." Proportionally, too much space is given to the "Reformation," whose political character is entirely ignored; but we discern a negative disapproval of Zwingli's propensity for war, by which he deservedly perished.

THE TRUE STORY OF THE CATHOLIC HIERARCHY DEPOSED BY QUEEN ELIZABETH. With Fuller Notices of Its Last Two Survivors. By the *Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.S.S.R.*, and the late *Rev. T. F. Knox, D.D.*, of the London Oratory. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

In these busy days of material inventions and scientific research, it is refreshing to meet with such a work as Father Bridgett has given us. For this is a selfish age, and in the onward rush, each one eager to outstrip his neighbor, the world soon ceases to think of those who have been called away from life's arena. In Father Bridgett's work we have an exception to the rule. Turning aside from more alluring paths, he has set

for himself the task—devoting to its performance much time and continuous painstaking labor—of doing justice to the memory of men who have been foully wronged by the pen of the historian.

His was no easy task. Obstacles of every kind opposed him. The work of the literary forger was aided and strengthened by the well-intentioned, yet nevertheless erroneous, statements of friends.

But for Father Bridgett, the memory of those noble bishops of the Church who suffered so much and so long for the faith in the time of England's Elizabeth, formerly styled "Good Queen Bess," but now that her real character is becoming more clearly known, infamous alike for her hypocrisy and her cruelty—would have gone down to posterity unhonored and defamed. Both designedly and inadvertently, great wrong has hitherto been done them. Even the usually careful and correct Lingard has unintentionally aided in the vile work. Trusting to unreliable authorities, and employing data whose source ought to have provoked suspicion, Catholic writers have not only not done those noble confessors of the faith full justice, but have greatly misrepresented them and done them positive injustice; whilst English Protestant writers have systematically conspired to defame them.

In order to conceal the hardness of Elizabeth's heart, and the unscrupulousness of her nature, they have sought, and in a great measure with success, to place those men before posterity, not as the victims of religious bigotry and hatred, which in fact they were, but as enemies of the State, men guilty of grave offences, as traitors and conspirators. In every possible way they have minimized the story of their sufferings. Heath, Bishop of York; Thurlow, Bishop of Ely; Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, and those other faithful Catholic bishops who lingered for years in English prisons, dishonest historians would have the world believe had no wrong done them, and were treated not only with leniency, but with extreme and unmerited kindness.

But though truth is proverbially slow in overtaking falsehood, sooner or later she overtakes and puts it to shame. Thanks to the laborious examination of original documents that have only recently been brought to light, and to opening to individual research and study by the English Government of State papers, which, until a few years ago, were hidden away in secret recesses, and carefully kept from examination, much material of great value for correcting misrepresentations, exposing falsehood, and bringing the truth to light, has been availed of.

Of these materials Father Bridgett has taken advantage, and in his work has thoroughly exposed the misrepresentations, currently believed, of those who so foully wrong these holy men. He tells the true story of their sufferings. His narrative is so well sustained, so clearly and palpably honest, that, on reading it one cannot repress a feeling of most intense indignation towards the men who dared to defame those noble and heroic Catholic bishops.

They suffered, not because they had sinned against the State, for no crime could be laid at their door, but because they were loyal to the visible head of the Church in Rome, and refused to acknowledge Elizabeth's impious pretensions to being the supreme spiritual head of the Church in England.

Clearly and beyond all shadow of a doubt Father Bridgett shows this. Unquestionably his book will do great good. Animated by the true story of the trials and sufferings of those heroic bishops, its readers will be led to love their faith with warmer love, and to stand by it more firmly.

THE BIRTH OF THE REPUBLIC. By *Daniel R. Goodloe*. Chicago, New York and San Francisco: Belford, Clarke & Co.

The title hardly does full justice to the character and scope of this volume. It is really a genesis, and, though not a perfect model of typographical elegance and accuracy, is a very useful compilation, not only for those who have not the original sources of our revolutionary history within their reach, but even for the scholar himself. A compilation for the most part it is, there being comparatively little original composition in it, and this, too, the least valuable part of the work, in which the author hazards opinions that will scarcely bear investigation. For instance, in closing his introduction, he says: "America made a successful rebellion at a time when the population was not above three millions. How idle the notion, then, that Great Britain could continue long to rule these colonies, inhabited by a free, energetic race, which doubles in numbers four times in a century!" Now, it is almost universally admitted that without the aid of France the American rebellion would have been unsuccessful, and it is far from likely that the population would have increased as rapidly in British colonies as it has done in a free country, whose resources would not have been developed as rapidly in the former condition.

But the quotations so skilfully arranged by Mr. Goodloe tell a most interesting and instructive story. They are "compiled from the national and colonial histories and historical collections, from the American archives and from memoirs, and from the journals and proceedings of the British Parliament," and contain "the resolutions, declarations, and addresses adopted by the Continental Congress, the provincial congresses, conventions and assemblies, of the county and town meetings, and the committees of safety, in all the colonies, from the year 1765 to 1776; to which is added the Articles of Confederation, a history of the formation and adoption of the Constitution, the election of President Washington, his inauguration April 30, 1789, a copy of the Constitution, and Washington's inaugural speech." Such is the scope of a book that gives us a pretty clear insight into the origin of our independence and greatness. And it is a good work as far as it goes; but it passes over two important points essential to a full understanding of the subject; namely, the religious and anti-Catholic character of the Revolution in its early stage, and the French alliance.

GEORGE WASHINGTON. By *Henry Cabot Lodge*. In two volumes. (American statesmen series.) Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889. For sale by the J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

The unique position occupied by Washington among the world's military and political heroes is certainly something for Americans to be proud of; for not only did he achieve independence for America, and take a large part in securing a stable government for the new country, but he has compelled praise and honor even from his and its enemies, from the whole world, in fact; and this because he won the far greater victory of conquering himself, in which respect he stands alone among the world's heroes, outside of the religious life. This much we must admit, even though it be true that the George Washington of history, with whom all his biographers and historians have made us familiar, is an idealized personage. Of him as a man we know little, almost nothing. Even Professor McMaster's lifting of the veil reveals to us not very much of his inner life, but it is probably nearly all that we will ever know, for the "father of his country" was always severely reticent about himself, and to his contemporaries the glory of his public deeds ever diverted

attention from his social characteristics and his conduct as a mere man. The present biographer and historian tries to combine both phases, and he succeeds as well as the circumstances will permit, though he is a little of a hero-worshipper without intending it; but if ever hero-worship was excusable, it certainly is so in the case of Washington. It is not too much to say that Mr. Lodge's work will take rank as a standard, and be to its hero, at least, a more graceful tribute than "the mighty cairn which the nation and the states have raised to his memory." Apropos of this monument that adorns (?) the capital that bears the name of the nation's hero, we notice a peculiar omission by Mr. Lodge. For it, he says, "stones have come from Greece, sending a fragment of the Parthenon; from Brazil and Switzerland, Turkey and Japan, Siam and India beyond the Ganges," and even from China. Why does he say nothing of the stone sent by the Pope from Rome, and consigned to an unknown part of the Potomac's bed by religious fanatics, whose ancestors probably fought against Washington while their Catholic fellow-countrymen were risking their all on behalf of the patriotic cause? He also thinks it not worth his while, we suppose, to notice the friendly relations existing between Washington and the representative American Catholics of his time, and his answer to their congratulatory address to him as President.

INSTITUTIONES LOGICALES SECUNDUM PRINCIPIA S. THOMÆ AQUINATIS AD USUM SCHOLASTICUM accommodavit *Tilmannus Pesch, S. J.* Pars I., Summa Præceptorum Logicæ; Pars II., Logica Major. Volumen I., Complectens Logicam Criticam et Formalem. Friburgi Brisgovie: Sumptibus Herder. (The same house, St. Louis, Mo.)

These two portly volumes belong to the series known as the "Philosophia Lacensis"; so called from the celebrated Jesuite establishment of Maria Lach. Begun, in 1880, with the "Institutiones Philosophiæ Naturalis," and continued in 1885 with the "Institutiones Juris Naturalis," the work has been delayed by the religious persecution in Germany and the ill-health of some of the writers; and, indeed, the editor of the present volumes dates his preface from Blijenbeck, in Holland. Lovers of scholastic lore should pray that no further troubles will delay the completion of the work, which is most valuable for reference. It is also well adapted for use as a class-book, the essential parts to be studied first being printed in large type, and the portions to be consulted only by the beginner and studied by the ripe scholar, in smaller letter. Copious and exact references to the authorities are given in footnotes. Each volume is also provided with a general or summarized index, and a special or analytical one.

The whole work is divided into two parts and five books. The first book containing a detailed history and a summary of the precepts of logic, and the second a sketch of the plan of scholastic logic. These two subdivisions fill a volume of well on to 600 closely-printed octavo pages, and the second volume, which is even larger, is taken up entirely with critical and formal logic. A third volume will be devoted to real or conceptual logic, embracing questions of ontology. As giving an idea of the thoroughness and scope of the work, we may point out that the historical chapter in the first volume fills over 75 pages, and the introductory disquisition in the second, 54 pages. Other chapters give even a fuller development of their particular themes.

A work on scholastic philosophy is herein given to the public that must naturally at once assume the position of a standard, both as a text-book and a work of reference.

SWEET THOUGHTS OF JESUS AND MARY. Meditations for the Feasts of Our Saviour and of His Blessed Mother. By *Thomas Carre*, Priest of the English College at Doway. Printed at Paris, A.D. 1658 and 1665. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns and Oates. 1889.

This is a volume of a series of "Old English Ascetic Books," edited by Orby Shipley, M.A. The real name of the author of the work before us was Miles Pinkney. When he went to Doway College, he assumed the name Thomas Carr or Carre, by which he was afterwards known.

He was ordained to the priesthood in 1625, and for nine years discharged the duties of procurator of the college to the satisfaction of all connected with the institution. He was then appointed chaplain and spiritual director of the Convent of Our Lady of Sion, a community of English ladies in Paris. For forty consecutive years Father Carre devoted himself assiduously to his charge, and also rendered valuable assistance, both pecuniary and spiritual, to the many English refugees and exiles who flocked to France during the disastrous times of the English Commonwealth. Father Carre was a prolific writer. The preface to the book before us gives a list of sixteen of his published works on various religious subjects. The volume we are noticing contains a selection from the meditations contained in the original work, and is confined to those which treat of the chief feasts of our Divine Lord and our Blessed Lady. The editor is of the opinion that a companion volume might well be compiled from other parts of the work, and styled "Sweet Thoughts of the Passion and Eucharist."

The meditations in the present volume are very brief, pointed, practical, and animated by a spirit of profound devotion. They furnish profitable and edifying reading to the laity as well as to religious.

KANT'S CRITICAL PHILOSOPHY FOR ENGLISH READERS. In two volumes. Vol. I., The Kritik of Pure Reason; Vol. II., Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics. By *John P. Mahaffy, D.D.*, and *John Bernard, D.D.*, Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin. A new and complete edition. New York and London: Macmillan & Co. 1889.

If all that has been written, both in commendation and condemnation, of Kant's system of philosophy, were collected and given to the world in book-form, it would fill many a volume. The work before us is a new and completed edition of his Critical Philosophy.

In a book notice, necessarily restricted as to its limits, it would be out of place to attempt a digest, or an analytical examination, of the work. Suffice it to say that Kant's ground is untenable. Like Descartes, he builds up a system of knowledge, beginning *a priori*, and, rejecting all previously admitted principles, together with the conclusions derived from them. In his "Criticism of Pure Reason" he endeavors to show how reason "as pure," that is, entirely independent of experience from without the mind, produces its own ideas, and, by virtue of this, the principles of knowing objects when presented to the mind.

This theory of Kant has been the battle-ground of many a learned and skilfully conducted controversy between men of powerful and acute intellects. But the theory is clearly wrong. For none but the Divine uncreated Intellect can be the source and cause of its own knowledge. That Kant was a great man, all must acknowledge. His works bear testimony to his mighty intellect. But, with all his greatness, cannot be more than a negative help to science.

The volumes before us are neatly bound; the paper and type are excellent. The editors, so far as we have observed, have done their work well.

THE PARNELL MOVEMENT, with a sketch of Irish Parties from 1843, with an addition containing a full account of the great trial instigated by the *London Times*, and giving a complete history of the Home Rule struggle from its inception to the suicide of Pigott. By *T. P. O'Connor, M.P.* Authorized version. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

We have copied the entire title page of this latest authorized edition of Mr. O'Connor's book, so that its scope can be seen at a glance; and its added pages, of which there are one hundred and fifty, justify the promise here held out. The reserve made in regard to several passages in the earlier edition, doing seeming injustice to certain Irish statesmen and politicians, applies to this edition as well; but with this reserve, the book is most valuable to students of recent and contemporary Irish history. The style is bright and terse, and the pen-pictures of men and events graphic and clear. There are four additional chapters in this volume, and they embrace all the leading events in Irish history, from the year 1880 until the wretched Pigott's disappearance. The subject of the first of these, the thirteenth of the whole work, is the Tory-Parnell combination; of the second, the Home Rule struggle; of the third, the Parliament of broken pledges; and of the fourth, the régime of brutality which is still in force. A copious index increases the size of the volume to almost seven hundred pages.

MODERN SCIENCE IN BIBLE LANDS. By *Sir J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., F.G.S.* New York: Harper and Brothers. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1889.

The author of this work is already well known for his contributions to the literature of science, especially by his "Story of the Earth and Man" and "Origin of the World." Though the motive of his latest book was, as he tells us, a desire "to share with others the pleasure and profit of a tour in Italy, Egypt and Syria," yet the result redounds to the pleasure of all who can read profitably the higher order of books of travel; for "it was his special aim to study such points in the geology and physical features of those countries as might throw light on their ancient history, and especially on the history of the sacred Scriptures." He also makes use of his experience as a geologist "to elucidate some difficult geological and historical questions, and to present to the reader, whether geological or non-geological, intelligible and, it may be, novel ideas as to the structure and history of the countries referred to." But it must not be understood that the present work is intended to discuss general questions bearing on the relation of the Bible to science; yet it is here clearly shown that the Biblical writers, in their references to nature, as it existed around them, were pre-eminently truthful.

A SHORT CUT TO THE TRUE CHURCH; OR, THE FACT AND THE WORD. By the *Rev. Father Edmund Hill, C.P.* Notre Dame, Indiana: Office of the "Ave Maria."

The author does not pretend to much originality in these pages, as he says he borrowed the idea of short cuts and tunnels from a passage of Father Fidelis's (James Kent Stone) "Invitation Heeded." This present volume, too, is a development of a Sunday evening lecture delivered in St. Louis six or seven years ago, and owes its actual shape to the suggestion and encouragement of Archbishop Ryan, then coadjutor to Archbishop Kenrick.

In this work of controversy Father Hill writes for all those outside the communion of Rome who believe in the divinity of Christ and the inspiration of the Four Gospels; and to these his intention is to show a

short cut to the truth which, had any one pointed it out to himself, would have saved him a circuitous journey. Four mountains of difficulty are to be tunneled, these being Papal supremacy, transubstantiation, auricular confession, and the honor paid to the Blessed Virgin. By his straight-forward treatment and cogent reasoning he has compiled a most useful manual for those in search of the truth about the points discussed.

THOUGHTS AND COUNSELS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF CATHOLIC YOUNG MEN. By *Rev. P. A. Von Doss, S. J.* Freely translated and adapted, by *Rev. Augustine Wirth, O.S.B.* Fr. Pustet & Co.: New York and Cincinnati, 1889.

Though bulky, and composed entirely of strictly spiritual reading, this work, to those who peruse it, and especially those for whom it is intended, will be found not only profitable, but decidedly entertaining. The work is subdivided into four books, of which the first, containing forty-one short chapters, is entitled "The Return"; the second, "Confirmation in Good," subdivided into forty-five chapters; the third, "Progress," has fifty-one; and the fourth, "Consummation," contains thirty-five chapters. Each chapter is a separate subject for fruitful meditation and deserves to be pondered well. The process of development adopted by the author supposes that "a young man has yielded to temptation; he has sinned more or less grievously . . . He is reminded of his final aim and end . . . He is shown how precious is the season of youth . . . He is encouraged to take steps toward reconciliation . . . A saving sacrament is pointed out to him . . . He is advised to approach it; and behold!—the dead young man arises from the grave!" Beyond this, he is constantly reminded that "final perseverance is granted only to persevering prayer."

INTRODUCTIO IN CORPUS JURIS CANONICI. Cum appendice Brevem Introductionem in Corpus Juris Civilis Continente. Exaravit *Dr. Franciscus Laurin*. Friburgi Brisgoviae et Vindobonae: Sumptibus Herder. MDCCCLXXXIX. (Same house, St. Louis, U. S. A.)

Here is presented a clear statement, in a concise text, with ample foot notes, of the elementary and fundamental principles of canon law, arranged so methodically as to be admirably adapted for use by those for whom they are intended, namely, students preparing for the priesthood. In an introductory chapter the subject is defined and the plan of arrangement set forth. The first part of the work proper, in eight chapters, discusses Gratian's decree; the second deals with the various collections of decretals, and this part is divided into six sections; and the third sets forth the body of canon law. In an appendix, of about a hundred and fifty pages, there is given a concise summary of the civil law of the Roman empire. The style is clear and simple, so as to be easily intelligible to any student.

THOMAE À KEMPIS DE IMITATIONE CHRISTI Libri Quatuor. Textus edidit, considerationes ad cujusque libri singula capita ex ceteris ejusdem Thomae à Kempis opusculis collegit et adjecit Hermannus Gerlach. Opus posthumum. Cum approbatione Archiepiscopi Friburgensis. Friburgi Brisgoviae: Sumptibus Herder. MDCCCLXXXIX. (Also same house, St. Louis, U. S. A.)

The learned doctor of sacred lore and canon of the Cathedral of Limburg, whose name appears as editor of this little work, and who unfortunately did not live to see it published, spent several years in the compilation of the notes that he has added to the immortal text that is now familiar to every Catholic reader, and to multitudes of Christians who are not Catholics. The text given here is that of Rosweyde's edi-

tion of 1626, and the additional considerations which are added after each chapter are taken from others of Thomas à Kempis's works. These are really important illustrations, and greatly enhance the book's value. We would like to see a well executed version in English of this annotated and handsomely printed edition.

SEVEN THOUSAND WORDS OFTEN MISPRONOUNCED. A complete Hand-Book of Difficulties in English Pronunciation, Including an Unusually Large Number of Proper Names and Words and Phrases from Foreign Languages. By *William Henry P. Phye*. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1889. Received from and for sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

There is no more obvious test of general culture than pronunciation of a spoken language. The moment the words of a speaker fall upon the ear of his hearers, an impression is made that is favorable or the reverse as to his culture. Even in a speaker of recognized ability, mispronunciations create the suspicion that his early, if not his later, education has been deficient in polish, or that he has not been accustomed to the society of refined people. These and other considerations make it highly important that every one should endeavor to acquire correct pronunciation, and avoid the mistakes which he hears constantly made by persons with whom he associates or is brought into contact.

The author of the work before us is a gentleman who has made the subject of correct pronunciation a special study, and who is thoroughly competent to treat it properly. The words contained in this volume are so numerous that they comprise almost all that are commonly mispronounced. In giving their correct pronunciation the author has followed the highest authorities on the subject. In addition to the list of words, the preliminary papers on the sounds of the English language, both native and adopted, and kindred topics, are valuable.

MORES CATHOLICI; OR, AGES OF FAITH. By *Kenelm H. Digby*. Vol. II. Containing Books V. and VI. New York: P. O'Shea, Publisher, 1889.

On the reception of the first volume of Mr. O'Shea's new edition of this incomparable work, we spoke of it in terms of high praise and at considerable length. The second volume, though received a few months ago, inadvertently escaped our attention until just now, when, through the last pages of the REVIEW being on the eve of going to press, we have neither time to prepare nor room to insert other than a very brief notice.

The volume now before us treats of the fourth of the "Beatitudes,"—"Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice." Like the preceding volume, it is a rich storehouse of erudition, ancient and modern; of lofty, ennobling and edifying thoughts, laborious and carefully gathered from the writings of the sages of antiquity, from the poets, historians and philosophers of all ages, the writings of the Christian Fathers, and from the treasures of wisdom contained in the sacred Scriptures. All these, so arranged as to throw a clear light upon the subjects treated, are illumined with the writer's own lofty imagination, and expressed in language of the highest beauty.

The work should have a place in the library of every clergyman, and in the home of every intelligent Catholic layman.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. By *Francis T. Furey, A.M.* New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1889.

In a previous number of the REVIEW we briefly noticed this work from proofs received in advance of its publication. We now re-express the

favorable opinion we then formed of it. Its method, style and contents are excellently well adapted to what should characterize a text-book, and the author has evidently carefully studied his subject. That subject, too, is one of high importance, and yet one to which, up to this time, very little attention has been paid in schools and colleges. We hope the work will be generally introduced into Catholic parochial schools, seminaries and colleges.

LIFE OF ST. BONAVENTURE, CARDINAL BISHOP OF ALBANO, SUPERIOR GENERAL OF THE FRANCISCAN ORDER. Translated by *L. C. Skey*. London: Burns & Oates, New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.

The name of the author of this biography of the seraphic doctor is not revealed, most probably by reason of humility; but we should like to know to whom to attribute the story as here told of the career of Jöhn, son of John Fidenza and his wife, Mary Ritellis. It is a model biography in brief compass, a narrative that lets the facts speak for themselves and the Saint make known his devotion in his own words. Though apparently very close to the original, the translation is more than fairly well done.

CHURCH HISTORY. By *Professor Kurts*. Authorized translation from the latest revised edition, by the *Rev. John Macpherson, M.A.* In three volumes. Vol. II. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1889.

The author's decidedly Protestant bias is shown more plainly in this volume than in the first. He of course justifies the "Reformation," with all of its social and political horrors and filth. The old exaggerated story of corruptions in the Church are dwelt upon in order to excuse the revolt, and the silly remedy is advocated of cutting off the head in order to cure the body. This part of the work is a libel on the times, a travesty of history as it should be written.

GERMANY'S DEBT TO IRELAND. By *Rev. William Stang, D.D.* New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1889.

American Catholics owe Rev. Dr. Stang a deep debt of gratitude for his fruitful labors in the field of history; and especially those of German and Irish origin for his present little pamphlet, in which he sketches the labors of Irish missionaries among the Teutons in the early Middle Ages. It is unnecessary to assure our readers that he has performed his self-imposed task, which to him must have been a labor of love, both carefully and satisfactorily.

THE ILLUSTRATED CATHOLIC FAMILY ANNUAL for 1890. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co.

The variety of subjects contained in this year's issue of the standard "Annual" is rich, and most interesting and timely as well. Besides correct calendars, there are many illustrated historical and biographical sketches, among the latter being memoirs of the late P. V. Hickey, Rev. Father Hecher, and the lamented editor of this Review, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Corcoran, D.D. The book is a manual of information which no intelligent family can well do without.

For
USE IN LIBRARY
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM LIBRARY

ANNEX

ANNEX

**STANFORD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**
Stanford, California

